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 (8)
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 (8)

FOIA F1737

Box Number 18291

SNYDER, S

11

ID	Doc Type	Document Description	No of Pages	Doc Date	Restrictions
24947	REPORT	FBIS REPORT ***PAR 8/14/2007 F1737***	~~45~~ 46	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.

THE WHITE HOUSE

Office of the Press Secretary
(Moscow, USSR)

For Immediate Release June 1, 1988

PRESS BRIEFING
BY
SENATORS ROBERT BYRD
AND ROBERT DOLE

Mezhdunarodnaya Hotel
Moscow, USSR

10:35 A.M. (L)

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Q Is that a yes or a no?

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

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

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

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

SENATOR BYRD: That's right.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

SENATOR BYRD: Couldn't be.

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

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

Q --

SENATOR DOLE: The mike doesn't work.

Q --

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

MR. DILLEN: Senator Dole?

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

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

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

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

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

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

MR. DILLEN: Thank you very much.

THE PRESS: Thank you.

END 11:00 A.M. (L)

THE WHITE HOUSE

Office of the Press Secretary
(Moscow, USSR)

For Immediate Release June 1, 1988

INTERVIEW OF
SECRETARY OF STATE GEORGE P. SHULTZ
BY
TOM BROKAW OF NBC NEWS

May 31, 1988

The Rossiya Hotel
Moscow, USSR

5:40 P.M. (L)

Q Mr. Secretary, are you making sufficient progress at this meeting on the difficult issues of long-range missiles and START? There is a realistic expectation that by the fall, or before the end of Mr. Reagan's term, there may be a need for another summit to sign a START treaty.

SECRETARY SHULTZ: I think there is at least a good possibility of completing a START treaty. But the problems are difficult. We've made headway in this meeting, but I wouldn't want to predict that we'll finish. It's possible, and we're going to try.

Q Are you making greater headway, however, than you had anticipated when you were arriving?

SECRETARY SHULTZ: Well, not greater than I anticipated, but maybe greater than you anticipated. I think it's not so much a question of anticipation as it is the fact that in two of the hardest areas that we've been considering, namely air-launched cruise missiles and how to count them, and in the the real difficult area of verifying mobile missiles, we've made some substantial headway; so that's good.

Q So, give us the odds for the fall, or later, on another summit meeting and a START treaty. Fifty-fifty, or better?

SECRETARY SHULTZ: Oh, listen, if I'm going to play Jimmy the Greek, you've got to pay me a lot more than I'm getting paid now. I think it's possible, and I think I'd leave it at that. But I think the tendency to focus on the START treaty and its prospects in a way misses the point of what's going on here. There is a very powerful assertion of a broad, four-part agenda which has real depth to it and real staying power to it. And we have made headway in all of those areas. And I think that is the deeper meaning of what's taking place here at this summit.

Q Mr. Secretary, as you know, a lot of people wonder whether or not Mikhail Gorbachev has lasting power. He is obviously an important element in this new realtionship with the United States. What's your best judgment about that?

SECRETARY SHULTZ: I think he is a very strong person, tremendously able, an attractive person. And insofar as you can see as you mingle around with him and his colleagues, he is very strongly respected.

Q And our best judgment is, from the American side, that he has secured his base at least for the time being?

SECRETARY SHULTZ: I would say so, yes. But it's

MORE

obviously so. There's a lot we don't know about what goes on inside the Kremlin. But I have mingled around among his colleagues and himself -- for instance, last night, and on many other occasions when I've been here -- and he is respected and looked to, and I think properly so; he's an able person.

Q President Reagan has been understandably critical of the continuing human rights violations in this country. But you have been a student of the Soviet Union for a long time. Could you give us your personal reaction to the scope of the change that is occurring within this system?

SECRETARY SHULTZ: If you read the theses that they have put forward for debate in the coming Party Congress, you read things that perhaps you thought you'd never read as being put forward by the Soviet Union. And they are calling for a society based on laws, they are talking about individual rights, of freedom of speech and expression, and assembly, freedom to protest. Of course, these are statements, and people look at say, what and where -- are the deeds going to be there? But we do see around us deeds as well. So it does look as though some important things are happening in the Soviet Union, and they've decided to do them because they think they're in their interests. And I would agree; they are in their interests, if they're willing to have that much change in their society.

Q Can you share with us at all President Reagan's reaction to many of these changes?

SECRETARY SHULTZ: It's very similar to mine, as he just made a speech to Moscow State University students, and he described things in a positive way, and you couldn't really tell whether he was describing the United States or somewhere else at some point, and he referred to perestroika as akin to the things he was talking about.

Q What are the chances for a real and significant agreement in the area of conventional arms? As you know, both sides have significant armies on the eastern Europe front. What do you think by the end of this year we'll have there -- the same number of armies, the same number of tanks, the same number of airplanes?

SECRETARY SHULTZ: I'd like to make several points, the first of which is that on our side, by far, the bulk of the armed forces and equipment and so forth are other countrys', our allies -- not ours. So this isn't a question of the United States and the Soviet Union sitting down and working something out, as in the case of the strategic arms treaty, or even the INF Treaty. That, of course, was also an Alliance matter to a very considerable degree, but the missiles were our missiles.

In this case, we're talking about negotiations between two alliances, and so the first thing we have to do in negotiations going on in Vienna is construct what people call a mandate for the negotiations that describes what they'll cover, and the scope and so on. And that's -- pretty good agreement on that now. And in Vienna, we insist on, and the Soviets now agree, a balanced outcome. A balanced outcome means that there has to be a line of agreement and performance in the field of human rights. And of course, we hang very strong on that, and we aren't there yet. But we're -- continue to work on it. So I hope that before long, the mandate will be completed. Once that's done, then the actual talks can start. And I wouldn't expect you could see any major outcomes to them quite that quickly.

Q Characterize for us briefly the tenor of the room when President Reagan and Mikhail Gorbachev sit down together.

SECRETARY SHULTZ: It's a businesslike kind of tenor, and I think people have gotten to the point where they feel comfortable talking to each other and talking rather frankly. And so there's direct talk; some of it's tough, critical; some of it finds

agreement. There is a kind of a maturity and potential stability to it that I think is quite healthy.

Q Thank you, Mr. Secretary.

END 5:50 P.M. (L)

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

For Immediate Release June 1, 1988

INTERVIEW OF
SENATOR HOWARD BAKER
BY PETER JENNINGS OF ABC

Rossiya Hotel
Moscow, USSR

6:00 P.M. (L)

Q -- Gorbachev and Mr. Reagan about progress. Be specific for us what it means.

SENATOR BAKER: I think we've had a lot of progress. I think that there are many thing yet not accomplished. For instance, we don't have a START treaty and that's a difficult complex subject, so we might not have a START treaty anytime soon. But we're making progress toward it. I think we've made progress, for example, on verification for mobile missiles if we decide -- agree to mobile missiles. We've made other progress in that field, but we've still a ways to go.

Q There has been talk of a START agreement before the end of Mr. Reagan's term. Is that not unrealistic?

SENATOR BAKER: I don't think so. I think both these men -- I think both the President and General Secretary Gorbachev sincerely want to make as much progress as possible in the time remaining in President Reagan's term, and I think there's a realistic possibility that they might finish it.

Q Is there not resistence from their own arms control negotiators who think it's just too complicated?

SENATOR BAKER: Oh, I don't think so. I think the President is very much in control of that situation and he's made it clear and said at Moscow University that he would like to have a treaty before the end of his term. And I'm confident that our negotiators will follow that lead.

Q There's some talk about another summit. How important is the talk?

SENATOR BAKER: Oh, well, I think it's purely theoretical. If we do get a START treaty before the end of the term, obviously you'd sign it someplace, and I suppose that would be a fifth summit. But you're not going to have a fifth summit, I don't think, just to have another summit. It would be for a very important event such as the completion of a START treaty. But the odds on finishing a treaty in this term are probably no better than 50/50.

Q In a sense, you've started some of the speculation about Mr. Gorbachev and Mr. Reagan not getting along very well on the question of human rights. Explain to us now how that issue has been handled and how Mr. Gorbachev has responded.

SENATOR BAKER: Well, you've got to keep in mind, as I'm sure you do, that this is their fourth meeting, they've really gotten to know each other very well, and the point that I've made before and would like to reiterate is these men talk about important issues. They talk about substantial issues and controversial issues. And they do it freely and enthusiastically. And that's important because it means that the likelihood of getting something accomplished is much greater. The meetings, beginning with the very first meeting, have been substantive meetings and they've been controversial meetings, but they've been very, very helpful meetings. And I think all of us who try to assist in that effort are very pleased with the degree of progress that we've made so far on human rights, on arms control, on regional issues, and on a couple of other things.

MORE

Q The Soviets were always aware of the approach you would take on human rights, and while offended, you're saying, never thought it would derail a summit.

SENATOR BAKER: No, I don't think so. And, you know, I think they've been remarkably understanding, but they take it to heart, I'm sure.

Q What is not going well?

SENATOR BAKER: Well, I think everything's going well. I think that the START negotiations, as we know, will be difficult and tedious, but we're making progress there. I think we've done a couple of other things that are important. I think that we've got ballistics missile notification agreement underway, and that's not unimportant. I think that the President and the General Secretary are -- have expressed their joint concern about completing -- being able to complete a START treaty, and I think that's progress. And altogether, I think it's been a remarkably successful summit.

Q What approach has Mr. Gorbachev taken on this occasion to Star Wars or SDI? Do you sense a Soviet acceptance that they'll never move this precedent now?

SENATOR BAKER: That is a matter that is in negotiation and I simply don't want to comment on it. As long as we're negotiating on it, I don't think it helps for me to try to describe our position or describe theirs.

Q Now, give us a clue to Ronald Reagan -- the person, the man with all the history. What's he getting out of this visit?

SENATOR BAKER: Well, I think he's already been a great president. I think he's done something president's almost never do, and that is he has made a change in the fundamental direction of public policy in our country. But I think he has a chance to be an historic president. I think the INF Treaty moves him in that direction. And if we could get an agreement on START, that would move him still further in that direction. But I think history will treat very well with Ronald Reagan, not only as an arms control president, but as a president who, in effect, brought the country along to reiterate his confidence in itself.

Q Forgive me, but I was looking for something simpler. Can you give us some kind of insight as to Ronald Reagan feels about being in Moscow?

SENATOR BAKER: It's hard to say. You know, I thought about that at Moscow University when I saw him before the bust of Lenin -- with the mosaic of the Baltic Revolution in the background. But I think he thinks of being in Moscow as a serious responsibility to try to arrive at a peaceful solution to many problems that beset our two nations. And I don't think the place, the locale has much to do with it. I think the drama is -- the drama that you and I perceive -- but I don't see that that has a particular effect on it. He's determined on the issue of civil rights, he's determined on arms control. He wants to move forward on a broad range of issues. He isn't afraid of anything. As the saying goes, I believe he'd charge hell with a fire extinguisher, and he talks very directly to these people and they talk very directly to him.

Q So he's not struck by the symbolism of it all?

SENATOR BAKER: And I think that's a healthy thing. Well, I'm sure he is, but if he is, it doesn't have a major effect on his negotiating position.

Q Okay. Thank you, Senator.

END 6:10 P.M. (L)

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

For Immediate Release June 1, 1988

INTERVIEW OF
NATIONAL SECURITY ADVISOR
GENERAL COLIN POWELL
BY BERNARD SHAW OF CNN

Rossiya Hotel
Moscow, USSR

5:30 P.M. (L)

Q I would like to begin by asking you this question: Will there be any discussions between the President and the General Secretary? What is the basic hangup of a START agreement?

GENERAL POWELL: Well, we're moving towards a START treaty, and most of the major issues having to do with the number of warheads, the number of missiles to be allowed have been resolved. But we're down to several key issues -- how to account for air-launched cruise missiles, what to do about sea-launched cruise missiles -- how to account for them, how to verify their presence or absense aboard ships, and we're still working out the issues of verification of mobile missiles, to see whether or not we can come up with a satisfactory verification regime so we could consider moving away from the U.S. position, which is more mobile missiles. These are very difficult issues, they are complex issues, they're technical issues.

At the summit so far, we have made some progress on our ALCM discussions, but I don't think that problem's solved yet. And we've made quite a bit of progress with respect to how we would go about verifying the location of mobile missiles. There has been quite a bit of convergence on U.S. and Soviet thinking on the verification of mobile missiles. So we've made progress -- not enough to say that the treaty is at-hand, but enough to say that we should have some optimism for the end of the year, perhaps, or at least working in that direction, as the President said -- let's keep working hard to see if we can get it completed before he leaves office. And I hope that that is still possible.

Q Is it safe to assume that at least by the last day of this summit these two powerful leaders will have a framework which they can announce?

GENERAL POWELL: No, they will not have a framework agreement, which is one of these little code words that get people a little bit excited. What you will see at the end of the summit is pretty much what we saw at the Washington summit, and what we've seen over the last several months, with respect to a START treaty -- cutting the size of the forces, the strategic forces, by about 50 percent so that each side will be allowed 6,000 warheads and within the 6,000 warheads, only 4,900 can be either ground or sea-launched ballistic missiles. And that's pretty well-known already. You won't see any startling new information in the joint communique that will be released on tomorrow.

Q We unfortunately cannot be where you go everyday at this superpower summit and that's inside the Kremlin walls, into the inner chambers of discussion. But it seems to us that the Soviets are feverish for a fifth summit.

GENERAL POWELL: Well, I don't detect fever yet. I

detect an openness on their part, and an openness on our part. There is time for a fifth summit, but nobody has given me any instructions, and I don't sense my Soviet colleagues are carrying any instructions to go forth and find a convenient time in the fall for a summit.

Both sides have left themselves open should the situation suggest later that a fifth summit might be useful to have before the President leaves office, but no firm decisions have been made yet.

Q Reagan-Gorbachev -- their discussions. What moment has been the most intense? Where have the most fireworks come?

GENERAL POWELL: Well, frankly, in the meetings that I've attended, there have been no fireworks. There have been good, candid discussions back and forth. Every now and then, a little bit of emotion creeps into the conversation, but no fireworks -- no shouting, no screaming, no pounding. Two men who understand one another -- who have respect for one another -- who have developed a certain rapport with each other since this is their fourth summit meeting -- expressing their views strongly and forcefully and persuasively, I might say. So, no fireworks. No shouting and screaming.

Q We know how this President likes to write out his speeches -- how he sends speechwriters back to their typewriters time and time again when he's not satisfied with phrasing, because he wants to communicate simply and directly. You saw that process internally. You saw how the President deliver his address -- you were the audience. What was this man trying to do -- what did he want to leave those students with?

GENERAL POWELL: In the Moscow State University speech? He loves talking to young people. And this was a golden opportunity for him to be the natural Ronald Reagan, talking about things that mean so much to him -- talking about American values, talking about the American system of government and why it has served our people so well. He wasn't there to preach to them about our system, but just to explain it to them, so that they would have a better understanding of the nature of the American system, and the nature of American people. And I think he got that message across very, very forcefully and very, very well, and I think he did very well -- as seen by the students. They seemed to enjoy it -- appreciate it. I spent most of my time looking around the audience to see their reaction, and it was quite favorable -- just like the reaction I might find in an American audience or an audience anywhere in the world listening to President Reagan for the first time talking about American values.

Q Looking back at yesterday, I must tell you that given the foray that the President conducted through this capitol on the fronts of freedom of religion, on the matter of the refuseniks, and general human rights, you could almost hear the Soviet officials gritting their teeth -- glad that this man's public schedule was over yesterday after the state dinner.

What are you hearing in back-channel terms about Soviet reaction to what the President of the United States was doing in Moscow yesterday?

GENERAL POWELL: Well, the Soviet people seemed to be quite responsive, and we have heard nothing to suggest that his message is causing any concern among the Soviet people -- and frankly, the Soviet officials listened very carefully to what he says. But at the same time, what he is saying is a consistent message that he has delivered for the last three years that he and the General Secretary have been talking -- that human rights, or humanitarian issues as the Soviets call it, is an important part of our agenda. We give it pride of place. We think it is proper for the President to carry this message -- to show what the American value system is like, to compare it to the Soviet value system, and then to encourage the General Secretary in his efforts not to become

a system similar to ours, but to see if he can tap the creativity that exists and is within the body politic, within the Soviet people. And allow them to be more creative by having freedom of expression, freedom of speech.

If you were to look at the theses that are going to be put before the whole party conference later this month, and compare it to some of the things that the President has been saying, you'll find an amazing similarity between what the General Secretary will be trying to get approval on later this month, and the sort of things the President has been speaking about this week. And the General Secretary and the President have discussed this openly and candidly without any ill feeling on their part or ours.

Q Last question -- you know how to size up people very well. You've seen Gorbachev several times, previous summits. What's your impression of him now, here in his own home turf?

GENERAL POWELL: He is as impressive in Moscow as he was in Washington. I have had occasion to meet with the General Secretary four times now; twice with the President and twice on my trips with Secretary Shultz. He is a very strong individual who has strong convictions, knows what he wants to do, is dynamic and forceful in the meetings, and I must say the Soviet people are quite lucky to have a leader of his conviction, dynamism and vision.

Q General Powell, thank you for joining us.

GENERAL POWELL: Thank you very much, Mr. Shaw.

Q You're welcome.

END 5:40 P.M. (L)

THE WHITE HOUSE

Office of the Press Secretary
(Moscow, USSR)

For Immediate Release June 1, 1988

REMARKS BY THE PRESIDENT
AND GENERAL SECRETARY GORBACHEV
IN EXCHANGE OF THE INF TREATY RATIFICATION DOCUMENTS

The Kremlin
Moscow, USSR

12:15 P.M. (L)

GENERAL SECRETARY GORBACHEV: Esteemed Mr. President, esteemed Mrs. Reagan, distinguished ladies and gentlemen, comrades: We are approaching the end of the meeting between the leaders of the Soviet Union and the United States of America, the fourth such meeting in three years. The visit of the United States President to our country is drawing to a close.

The President and I have summed up the results of a dialogue between our two countries at the highest level. We have discussed both the immediate and longer-term prospects for Soviet-U.S. relations. We have signed documents which record what has been achieved and provide guidelines for the future. Among them, an historic place will belong to the ratification documents which give effect to the treaty on intermediate- and shorter-range missiles.
The exchange a few minutes ago of the Instruments of Ratification means that the era of nuclear disarmament has begun.

Assessing the work done over these past few days, we can stay our satisfaction, say that what has been happening these days in Moscow is big politics, politics that effect the interests of millions and millions of people. Each such meeting dealt a blow at the foundations of the Cold War. Each of them made huge breaches in the Cold War fortress and opened up passages to modern, civilized world politics worthy of the truly new times.

But big politics means difficult politics in which every step is not easy to take. Weighing carefully each one of our new steps, we measure it against the security interests of our two nations and of the world as a whole. For that is the only way to achieve truly substantial results with the necessary margin of viability. Big politics also means big responsibility and so it cannot be built on pursuing only one's own interest, which is always inherently one-sided.

Such politics also needs a great idea. Humankind has conceived that idea in the pangs of wars and disasters, tragedies and calamities, strivings and discoveries of the 20th century. This, in our view, is the idea of a nuclear-free and nonviolent world. It is that idea that is inscribed in the mandate which the Soviet people give to their representatives at the start of any negotiations. This particularly applies to our negotiations with the United States of America.

Addressing the Soviet people and the Americans, addressing all nations from these hallowed steps of the Moscow Kremlin, I hearby declare we have been working honestly and with perseverance, and we shall continue to do so, to fulfill that historic mandate.

The first lines have already been written into the book

MORE

of a world without wars, violence, or nuclear weapons. I believe that no one can now close that book and put it aside. President Ronald Reagan and I have agreed that the immediate task before us, which is to conclude a treaty on a 50-percent reduction in strategic offensive arms, can and must be accomplished. In our joint endeavors and discussions, we have learned to understand each other better; to take into account each other's concerns and to search for solutions.

The atmosphere in our relations is improving. We're working to make it a constant, not only in our official contacts, but also in the day-to-day management of Soviet-U.S. relations. In this, too, we are guided by a mandate from our peoples.

Thanks to the atmosphere of the meetings in Washington and in Moscow, and as a result of the agreements reached, Americans and Soviet people now have more opportunities for communication and for getting to know each other. I'm convinced that scientists, students, schoolchildren, cultural personalities, ordinary tourists, athletes, and of course businessmen, will continue to enlarge and add new colors to the fabric of cooperative and even friendly relations. Sometimes, they can do that better than politicians.

Historians who will one day describe and evaluate what is now being being done have probably not yet been born. But every day, babies are being born who will live in the 21st Century and to whom we must bequeath a safe and humane world.

On behalf of the Soviet leadership and the Soviet people, I wish to tell all those who are concerned, and yet hopeful about the future, we shall work to achieve that goal, and we can only do it by working together. Thank you. (Applause.)

THE PRESIDENT: Mr. General Secretary, these are historic moments. As we exchange these documents, the instruments of ratification, this treaty, the terms of which we formally agreed to last December in Washington, enters into force.

Mr. General Secretary, you know that our way here has not been easy. At crucial moments your personal intervention was needed and proved decisive, and for this we are grateful. So too, Mr. General Secretary, you are aware of how important the objective, not just of arms control, but of arms reduction, has been to my own thinking, and to the policy of my administration since its outset.

Seven years ago, when I first suggested the concept of a double-zero treaty, there were those who said that this was so unrealistic an idea that it was irresponsible to even propose it. Others simply dismissed the concept as a propaganda ploy or a geopolitical gambit.

But skepticism and doubt bring a barren harvest. And today, on this table before us, we see the fruits of hope -- evidence of what candor and realism can accomplish. We have dared to hope, Mr. General Secretary, and we have been rewarded.

For the first time in history, an entire class of U.S.-Soviet nuclear missiles is eliminated. In addition, this treaty provides for the most stringent verification in history. And for the first time, inspection teams are actually in residence in our respective countries.

And while this treaty makes possible a new dimension of cooperation between us, much remains on our agenda. We must not stop here, Mr. General Secretary; there is much more to be done.

As will be seen in our joint statement later today, more progress has been made toward a strategic arms treaty during our meetings. We must try to move forward in the months ahead to complete this START treaty as soon as possible. So let us continue to expand the frontiers of trust, even as we verify, Mr. General

Secretary, even as we verify.

Mr. General Secretary, we've agreed many times that there remain differences, important fundamental differences, between us. Yet as we work over the long run to narrow these differences, as we work for what I hope will be a new era of peace and expanded human freedom, we must also acknowledge our solemn responsibility to take steps now to reduce the chances of conflict and to prevent war.

This we have done today, a first step toward a brighter future, a safer world. America's allies and friends welcome this treaty too. We consulted them fully during its negotiation. We made clear that we would never put their security or their interests at risk, that on the contrary we would sign a treaty only if it enhanced their security, as this one does.

And finally, if I may, I would like to take a moment to thank the United States Senate for their work on this treaty. The way of democracy is sometimes a complicated way, and sometimes trying. But it is a good way, and we believe the best way.

And once again, Mr. General Secretary, I want to extend to you and to all those who labored so hard for this moment, my warmest personal thanks. (Applause.)

END 12:40 P.M. (L)

THE WHITE HOUSE

Office of the Press Secretary

For Immediate Release June 4, 1988

RADIO ADDRESS
BY THE PRESIDENT
TO THE NATION

The Oval Office

12:06 P.M. EDT

THE PRESIDENT: My fellow Americans, it was just yesterday that I returned from my historic Moscow summit meeting with General Secretary Gorbachev. And it so happens that later this month I'll be visiting Canada for an economic summit with the leaders of the world's industrialized nations. I thought I'd take a few moments to tell you about both.

First, my meeting with General Secretary Gorbachev in Moscow. The event that held perhaps the most immediate historic importance took place on Wednesday. It was then that General Secretary Gorbachev and I exchanged the Instruments of Ratification, bringing into effect the INF Treaty. The effect of this treaty will be very simply to eliminate an entire class of U.S. and Soviet intermediate-range nuclear missiles.

The significance of the INF Treaty can hardly be overstated. For the first time ever, the levels of nuclear arms will actually be reduced, rather than having caps places on their growth. These missiles will not simply have been shuffled around on the map or placed in storage; they will have been destroyed. The exchange of these Instruments of Ratification alone would have made the Moscow summit a success, but the General Secretary and I made important progress in other areas as well.

We moved ahead on START negotiations, negotiations that would lead to a dramatic reduction in both sides' arsenals of strategic nuclear arms.

On bilateral issues, I'm especially pleased by our agreement to hold increased exchanges involving high school students. The number of students will at first be in the hundreds, but could grow into the thousands. Imagine it; hundreds and then thousands of young people who have firsthand knowledge of each other's country and, yes, who have made friends.

Turning to regional conflicts, Mr. Gorbachev and I discussed ways to reduce tension in areas around the globe -- Southeast Asia, Africa, Central America, the Persian Gulf, and the Middle East. The withdrawal of Soviet troops from Afghanistan, of course, represents an historic step in itself, one that the General Secretary and I agreed could serve as a model for settling other regional conflicts.

A key part of my agenda for this Moscow summit, as for my previous meetings with the General Secretary, involved human rights. Recently, the Soviets have begun to show somewhat more respect for human rights. In the past year, for example, they have released some 300 political detainees from detention. It's my hope that what took place on my Moscow visit will lead to still greater individual freedom for the peoples of the Soviet Union.

You see, in addition to my meetings with Mr. Gorbachev, I held other meetings -- with monks at a monastery in Moscow; with nearly 100 dissidents and refuseniks, men and women who have worked

for years for the freedom to speak, to worship, to assemble, and to travel; and at Moscow University with students -- indeed, with the very students likely to become the Soviet Union's next generation of leaders.

To the dissidents and refuseniks, I was able to say, the people of the United States and elsewhere support you. To the students, I suggested, there is another way to live and govern your country, a way of democracy and economic growth, a way in which creative human energies are released. If anyone had suggested, even as recently as 10 years ago, that an American president would one day be able to meet with Soviet dissidents inside Moscow itself, or be able to speak to Soviet students in their own university about human freedom, well, I think you'll agree that a prediction like that would have been dismissed. But this past week, it happened.

Seeds of freedom and greater trust were sown. And I just have to believe that, in ways we may not even be able to guess, those seed will take root and grow.

Accompanying these new political freedoms are a series of economic reforms that may begin to inject elements of free enterprise into the Soviet economy. In two weeks, I'll be attending my final economic summit in Toronto, where the Western countries will celebrate the success of free markets. It's my belief that liberty should be as important a concern in Toronto as it was in Moscow.

Liberty in the economic sphere means low taxes; it means paring away needless regulations and reducing counterproductive government planning and interference; and it means keeping down barriers to international trade here and around the world.

Until next week, thanks for listening, and God bless you.

END 12:11 P.M. EDT

THE WHITE HOUSE

Office of the Press Secretary

For Immediate Release June 3, 1988

REMARKS BY THE PRESIDENT AND
VICE PRESIDENT UPON THE PRESIDENT'S
ARRIVAL FROM MOSCOW SUMMIT

Andrews AFB, Maryland

4:45 P.M. EDT

THE VICE PRESIDENT: Mr. President and Mrs. Reagan, I'm delighted to say on behalf of the people of the United States of America, welcome home and well done. (Applause.)

Everyone in America watched your historic trip and hoped for the best and pulled for you. And now it's over and we can all say that you made a historic contribution to peace in the world.

On arms control, Mrs. Thatcher probably put it best when she said that you have bravely gone forward in spite of the voices of denial and doubt; you showed the only way to succeed is by retaining your resolve and speaking with conviction.

As for the latter, I suspect you know, Mr. President, that you caught a little flack for bringing up the issue of human rights so forcefully right there in the heart of the Soviet system. (Applause.) But most Americans felt as I did -- we have a tradition of freedom and a history of free speech and what's wrong with telling the other guy how you feel?

The fact is you made us proud. This week an American President strode the hard ground of Red Square and reminded the world through the sureness of his step and the lilt of his words what a bracing thing freedom is -- what a moving and bracing thing. (Applause.)

So welcome back, Mr. President. It's good to see you. God bless you and Nancy. (Applause.)

THE PRESIDENT: Well, thank you all very much. As some of you may have heard, Mr. Gorbachev and I've been trading Russian proverbs this week. (Laughter.) But you know, flying back across the Atlantic today, it was an American saying that kept running through my mind. Believe me, as far as Nancy and I are concerned, there's no place like home. (Applause.)

We want to thank all of you for coming out today. We're grateful for your enthusiasm and for the warmth of your welcome. And take it from me, all this red, white and blue scenery hits these two weary travelers right where we live. (Applause.) If I might paraphrase George M. Cohen, some may call it a flag-waving, but right now I can't think of a better flag to wave.

We're a little tired but we're exhilarated at what has happend. Exhilarated, too, at the thought of the future and what may lie ahead for the young people of America and all of the world. The events of this week in Moscow were momentous. Not conclusive perhaps, but momentous. And believe me, right now momentous will do just fine.

You know, it's occurred to me that time does have a way of sorting things out. For many years now, Americans have seen the danger of war and pleaded the cause of peace. And other Americans

have seen the danger of totalitarianism and pleaded the cause of freedom. So I was just thinking -- why don't we just agree today on something that maybe we should have been saying to each other all along, that we're all Americans and that we all have one and the same burning cause in our hearts -- the cause of world peace and the cause of world freedom. (Applause.)

Peace and freedom are what this trip was about and we saw some real progress in several areas in Moscow -- on human rights, on regional conflicts, on greater contacts between the people of the Soviet Union and the United States. We exchanged the documents that put into force an historic treaty that eliminates for the first time an entire class of U.S. and Soviet nuclear weapons and establishes real breakthroughs in verification procedures. And we made tangible progress toward and even more historic treaty on strategic weapons. Yes, a 50 percent reduction in nuclear weapons. All of this was good and promising for the future.

But there's something else I want to tell you about. I wish you could've seen the faces we saw in the Soviet Union. As I said to the young people at Moscow State University, it was hard, really, to tell them apart from any other group of students -- in our country or anywhere else in the world. And as I told Mr. Gorbachev, there were also the faces -- young and old -- we saw on the streets of Moscow. At first more than anything else they were curious faces, but as time went on the smiles began and then the waves. And I don't have to tell you Nancy and I smiled back and waved just as hard.

The truth came home to us once again. It isn't people, but governments that make war. And it isn't people but governments that erect barriers that keep us apart.

Much is happening in the Soviet Union. We hope and pray that the signs of change continue there. Our pledge -- Mr. Gorbachev and I -- is to work to continue building a better understanding between our two countries. But let's remember, too, that just as our forward strategy of peace and freedom anticipated positive changes, it remains ready to take us over any bumps in the road. And that's because our strategy is based on faith in the eventual triumph of human freedom.

That faith in freedom -- that abiding belief in what the unfettered human spirit can accomplish -- defines us as a people and a nation. And you know, I've been told that even a few veteran journalists said a chill went through them this week at a sight they never thought they would see in their lifetime -- an American President there in the heart of Moscow talking about economic, political and individual freedoms to the future leaders of the Soviet Union, explaining that freedom makes a difference, and explaining how freedom works. Talking, too, about the possibility of a new age of prosperity and peace, where old antagonisms between nations can someday be put behind us. A new age that can be ours if only we'll reach out to it.

Ladies and gentleman, all across our country during these weeks of spring it's graduation time. And I hope our young graduates know what a sudden, startling future may now be before them -- a future brought about by a technological and information revolution based on a growing understanding of the nexus between economic growth and creative freedom.

But I hope, too, that young Americans -- and all Americans -- will always remember that this revolution is only the continuation of a revolution begun two centuries ago -- a revolution of hope, a hope that someday a new land might become a place where freedom's light would beacon forth. That faith in freedom, that belief in the unalienable rights of man, begun in Carpenters Hall in Philadelphia traveled last week to the Lenin Hills in Moscow. It was the selflessness of so many Americans that brought it there -- selflessness by Americans for over two centuries, but especially by

those Americans who fought what has truly been called the "Twilight Struggle" of the post-war years. A struggle where national interest was not always clearly defined or adversaries easily identified or sacrifice fully appreciated. Now more than ever, we must continue. The judgment of future generations will be harsh upon us if after so much sacrifice and now at the hour of hope, we falter of fail.

Let us resolve to continue one nation, one people, united in our love of peace and freedom, determined to keep our defenses strong, to stand with those who struggle for freedom across the world, to keep America a shining city, a light unto the nations.

And let us remember, too, that there's work remaining here at home, that whatever the accomplishments of America, we must never be prideful toward others. We have much to learn from peoples of foreign lands and other cultures, nor should we ever grow content. Let us never rest until every American of every race or background knows the full blessing of liberty until justice for all is truly justice for all. (Applause.) And most of all, let us remember that being an American means remembering another loyalty -- a loyalty as the hymn puts it, "To another country I have heard of, a place whose King is never seen and whose armies cannot be counted."

And yet if patriotism is not the only thing, it is one of the best things. And we can be grateful to God that we have seen such a rebirth of it here in this country. (Applause.) And you know it's true, frequently when such moments happen in a nation's history, there's a popular saying or song that speaks for that time. And just maybe this verse sounds familiar to you, "If tomorrow, all the things were gone I'd worked for all my life, and I had to start again with just my children and my wife, I'd thank my lucky stars to be living here today 'cause the flag still stands for freedom and they can't take that away. (Applause.)

Nancy and I have full hearts today. We've grateful to all of you and to the American people, grateful for the chance to serve, grateful for all the support and warmth that you've given us over the years. And you know what else? We think our friend Lee Greenwood has it just right, "All our days, and especially today, there ain't no doubt we love this land. God bless the USA." (Applause.)

END 5:00 P.M. EDT

FOREIGN BROADCAST INFORMATION SERVICE

Daily Report

Supplement

(b) (3)

Soviet Union

FBIS-SOV-88-104S
Tuesday
31 May 1988

DECLASSIFIED IN PART
NLS F1737 #24947
By LGL, NARA, Date 8/14/07

Soviet Union
SUPPLEMENT

FBIS-SOV-88-104 *31 May 1988*

CONTENTS

USSR-U.S. SUMMIT

Reagan Pre-Summit Activity in Helsinki Reported 1
- Remarks in Helsinki Cited 1
- Helsinki Speech 'Incomprehensible' *[Kobysh]* 1
- Speech Seen as 'Insincere' *[Kobysh in IZVESTIYA 29 May]* 1
- Radio Address Reported 3
- Interview With OGONEK Cited 3
- Interviewed by Soviet TV 3
- Reagan Departs Helsinki 7

Reagan Moscow Arrival, 29 May Activities Noted 7
- Gromyko Welcomes Reagan 7
- More on Airport Welcoming 7
- Reagans Tour Historic Street 8
- Gorbachev Welcomes Reagan 8
- Further on Gorbachev Greeting *[PRAVDA 30 May]* 9
- Gorbachev Kremlin Speech Reported 9
- Reagan Replies 10
- Reagan, Gorbachev Answer Questions 11
- Reagan-Gorbachev Talks Begin 11
- Reagan Describes Talks 11
- Gerasimov Characterizes Talks 11
- Shultz Notes 'Good Beginning' 12
- Baker Reacts to First Round 12
- Meeting in 'Spirit of Goodwill' 12
- Roundup of Day One *[PRAVDA 30 May]* 12

Reagan Activities, Meetings of 30 May Reported 13
- Second Day of Talks Opens 13
- Gorbachev Remarks Highlighted 14
- Visit to Danilov Monastery 14
- Meeting With 'Dissidents' Opens *[Staroselskiy]* 15
- Questioned on Dissidents Meeting 15
- Meeting With Dissidents Criticized *[Staroselskiy]* 16
- Pozner Views Meeting *[Tokyo NHK Television]* 16
- Kremlin Dinner Begins 17

Shevardnadze, Shultz Meet; Working Groups Formed 17

Defense Chiefs Yazov, Carlucci Hold Talks 17
- Yazov Comments 17
- Meeting Described 18
- Further on Meeting 18

Yakovlev Holds Talks With USIA's Wick 18

USIA's Wick Interviewed on Relations 19

Adamishin, Schifter Discuss Human Rights 27 May 19

Yakovlev Receives 'Sane Freeze' Group 19

Family of Slain Stewardess Hopes To Meet Reagan 19

Patriarch Prays for 'Success' of Summit 20

Church Leaders Send Message to Reagan, Gorbachev 20

Soviet Commentators Criticize U.S. Rights Stance 21
Reagan Tries To 'Preach' 21
Bovin on 'Political Tact' *[IZVESTIYA 28 May]* 21
Kornilov Views Discussions 22
U.S. 'Public Organizations' Cited 23
Pozner on Rights, Summit *[Tokyo NHK Television]* 23
Korionov Reviews U.S. Record *[PRAVDA 27 May]* 24
Newsmen Briefed on Human Rights *[ARGUMENTY I FAKTY No 22]* 25
Gerasimov on Rights, Afghanistan 25
Jews To Demonstrate Outside U.S. Embassy Moscow *[AFP]* 26
Spokesman Denies Jews Prevented From Leaving 26
Summit Press Center Officials Discuss Meeting 26
Broadcasting Official Interviewed 26
Gerasimov on Coverage Plans 27
Gerasimov on INF Ratification 27
Gerasimov: 'Positive View' of Treaty 27
Moscow-Washington Radio Link Set for 2 Jun 27
PRAVDA's Vasilyev Previews Summit *[28 May]* 28
Petrovskiy, Akhromeyev Presummit Briefing *[PRAVDA 27 May]* 29
General Chervov Comments on Summit Talks 32
'Military Aspects' of Relations 32
Discusses Summit Prospects *[East Berlin]* 32
Academician Velikhov on Hopes for Summit 33
'Top Priority' Program Focuses on Summit *[Pozner, Bogdanov, (Moloshchenko)]* 34
PRAVDA Notes Soviet Expectations of Summit *[29 May]* 37
Prospects for Future Relations 'Optimistic' *[Oganov in SOVETSKAYA KULTURA 28 May]* 37
TASS Assesses Significance of Summit 38
Correspondent Discusses Reagan's 'Changed' Views 38
Arbatov Discusses Reagan's 'Harsh Tone', Summit 39
Zorin Stresses Importance of 'Dialogue' 40
Army Daily Traces Summit Process, Prospects *[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 28 May]* 40
'Negative' Pre-Summit Media Coverage Noted *[Linnik in PRAVDA 29 May]* 42
Biryukov Analyzes Reagan's 'Turnaround' 42

Reagan Pre-Summit Activity in Helsinki Reported

Remarks in Helsinki Cited

[redacted]2705145688 *Moscow TASS in English 1441 GMT 27 May 88*

[Text] Helsinki May 27 TASS—U.S. President Ronald Reagan, in the Finnish capital on his way to Moscow, today spoke at Finlandia Hall which witnessed the signing of the final act of the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe 13 years ago.

This important document reflected the political will of the states and peoples to improve and invigorate relations and promote peace in Europe.

The head of the White House paid special attention to issues of implementing the Helsinki Accords and remarked on the agenda of the forthcoming Soviet-American summit talks in Moscow.

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

In Moscow, the President said, "we will discuss security issues. We will pursue progress in arms reduction negotiations across the board and continue our exchanges on regional issues."

The sides would also discuss various aspects of bilateral relations, including economic, scientific and cultural links and people-to-people exchanges and identify new ways to cooperate.

Reagan expressed the hope that the discussions would produce good results.

The American President paid much attention to human rights as this issue is seen by the present administration.

Reagan made an attempt to teach the Soviet Union how to conduct affairs in this area, giving American recipes to the Soviet leadership and to the Soviet people.

The head of the White House apparently failed to take into account that all the 10 principles of the final Helsinki act on relations among states and human rights had been enshrined in the USSR Constitution adopted way back in 1977, which is convincing evidence of the USSR's recognition and respect for the fundamental Helskini accords.

Helsinki Speech 'Incomprehensible'

[redacted]2805213288 *Moscow Television Service in Russian 1705 GMT 28 May 88*

[From the "Vremya" newscast]

[Text] [Announcer] As has already been reported, President Reagan delivered a speech in Helsinki on the eve of his visit to Moscow. Over to Vitaliy Kobysh, political observer for the newspaper IZVESTIYA.

[Kobysh] Good evening, comrades! Were I unaware of how the administrative mechanism in the Washington White House worked, I would have thought that someone there had made a serious gaffe, and that heads would roll. However, while it seems that heads are not destined to roll, there has been, to put it mildly, an odd affair indeed.

As is known, on 23 May, the newspaper THE WASHINGTON POST and the weekly NEWSWEEK, as well as the Soviet mass media, simultaneously published Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev's replies to questions from the aforementioned American publications. You will recall that the general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee spoke enthusiastically about the American people, and gave a detailed description of relations between our two countries. Among other things, he mentioned those Americans who are convinced that everything American is best. These are the people who believe that everything else is worse, if not the worst and useless at any rate. For the sake of our mutual understanding, please—Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev implored—do not try to teach us to live according to American standards. Nothing will come of it, anyway.

A few days later, U.S. President Reagan delivered a very lengthy speech in Helsinki. Having spoken about the importance of the upcoming Soviet-U.S. summit, he then started to teach us to live according to U.S. standards, all but demanding that we change our foundation and way of life. And all that just 2 days before his arrival in Moscow, where a dialogue is to be held that the world expects a great deal of. Why did he do that? What sort of prelude is that to a dialogue between equal partners? It is incomprehensible even if some sort of mistake actually were made, and Reagan was not informed of what the Soviet leader said.

Speech Seen as 'Insincere'

[redacted]2905143988 *Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 29 May 88 Morning Edition p 5*

["Political Observer's Opinion" by Vitaliy Kobysh: "What Are the Visitors Bringing With Them?"]

[Text] U.S. President Ronald Reagan arrived in Helsinki 4 days prior to the start of his visit to the USSR. It was said that this was done for the purpose of adjusting to European time, for adaptation in general. Quite a normal and, one could even say, sensible action. One could, but....

It appears that 4 days proved to be rather too long. On the day after his arrival in the Finnish capital the U.S. President addressed the Paasikivi Society and the Union of "Finland-America" Societies. Once again, one could feel pleased that R. Reagan had adapted so quickly and regained his form. Alas, once again a "but."

Of course, being in the city where the Final Act of the All-European Conference was signed, the U.S. President paid lavish compliments to both the city and the act. Of course, he uttered some very apt words about the importance of the forthcoming Moscow meeting and the questions to be discussed there. But then he turned into the customary channel and delivered to us, the citizens of the USSR, yet another lecture on how we ought to build our sociopolitical system, what our next reforms ought to be, and generally on the way we ought to live.

R. Reagan—and this is not hard to guess, knowing his former statements—is most concerned with Soviet people's rights and freedoms. All manner of things were said. That he cannot understand "why Soviet citizens wishing to exercise their right to emigrate should be subjected to artificial restrictions and depend on arbitrary decisions." Also, that "there are no reasons why the Soviet Union should not free all those who are still imprisoned for expressing political or religious beliefs or for organizing the monitoring of the fulfillment of the Helsinki Conference's Final Act." And even a bitter tear moistened the President's eye when he recalled that in the past Moscow was renowned as "the city of the Forty Forties" because "the city's churches had 1,600 belfries," while now "the number of functioning churches is relatively small and there are almost no church bells."

The U.S. President seems to be more concerned than we ourselves are with everything we are doing, everything we are struggling against, everything we are restructuring. This is probably what prevented him from waiting to arrive in Moscow where he will be briefed on everything he wishes. Where he will be able to see for himself that persons wishing to leave our country can exercise this right provided there are no circumstances contrary to legal requirements. Where he will be able to observe pluralism of opinions. Where, if he so wishes, he can hear the mellow chimes of church bells at the Svyato-Danilov Monastery.

Americans just love to preach to others. They love to lecture others. And not just us. They try to teach everybody to live according to the American way.

And so, what is the meaning of these lectures? As always, one and the same thing, I think. Yes, R. Reagan has changed considerably in his more than 7 years in power. This is one of the reasons which made possible the summit meetings in Geneva, Reykjavik, and Washington, and now in Moscow. This is why the treaty on intermediate- and shorter-range missiles was signed, and why our two countries are engaged in preparing an agreement which would destroy 50 percent of their strategic offensive weapons.

All this is true. But even so, deeds are one thing, while the soul is something else. The U.S. President no longer risks publicly dubbing us an "evil empire." The speech did also contain compliments about us. Condescending compliments. The only thing I fear is that, deep down, he has not changed his opinion of us. And this is why I perceive as insincere, for example, his concern about the course of our restructuring, the process of democratization and glasnost. If for no other reason than the fact that they would mean not less but more socialism in our society. More.

There is also something else, and it is not new either. The President delivered his speech in Helsinki to the Paasikivi Society and the Union of "Finland-America" Societies, but it was addressed to quite a different audience. It was clearly addressed to the right-wingers in America, who are not very happy with the treaty on intermediate- and shorter-range missiles, the constructive Soviet-U.S. talks on other international problems, and even with R. Reagan's actual visit to Moscow. They would like something with which to frighten the world.

I get the impression that the U.S. President is now tormented by questions like those which beset Hamlet. On the one hand he has already done much to enable him to go down in history as a peacemaker president. On the other hand, there is a fear: How will all this be perceived by the right-wing benefactors, will they not in the end organize some sort of trouble (and this has happened in the United States, including in recent U.S. history).

Hence, in his speeches R. Reagan alternates sentences that contradict one another. For example, how are we to understand the following use of words in that same Helsinki speech: "One of the lessons which we learned again from the events which led to the signing of the treaty on intermediate- and shorter-range missiles is that, in today's conditions, peace on earth really depends on the West's strength and determination." Is this the old "position of strength" policy again? What R. Reagan said leaves no doubt that this is precisely so. That is for consumption by the right-wingers in the United States. As for the others, so that they should not think altogether badly of the U.S. President, they were offered something else in the next breath: "By strength we do not mean diktat, in other words the imposed solution of problems; we mean confidence at talks." So what do we have for all that: "the West's strength and determination" or "confidence at talks"? Take it any way you like.

The question asked, not only by us Soviet people but also by all peoples who are tensely awaiting the results of the forthcoming Soviet-U.S. summit meeting in Moscow, is: What is the U.S. President bringing with him? We will soon find out. We would all very much like to hope that

the dialogue will be productive and will not consist merely of lectures, sermons, and reminders about "the strength of the West." Otherwise the dialogue will become a monologue. And, in conclusion, one more observation. All the same the U.S. President does not seem to have adapted very well in the Finnish capital. As you have seen, the speech he delivered is not notable for its tactfulness or the soundness of its argument. And he quite inappropriately chose as the venue for delivering this speech the city with whose name we link the ideas of peace and friendship among peoples. As for the timing of its delivery—on the eve of the Moscow talks—that was altogether inappropriate.

Radio Address Reported

[8]05191388 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1845 GMT 28 May 88

[Text] Washington, 28 May (TASS)—President Reagan devoted his regular Saturday radio address to the country entirely to his upcoming talks in Moscow. Noting that this would be his fourth meeting in 3 years with Mikhail Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, the President stressed that "what has already been achieved in such a short space of time inspires great hope for a brighter future and a safer world."

The President stressed: "We have concluded the historic INF Treaty, which makes provision for the complete elimination of an entire class of U.S. and Soviet nuclear missiles." At the same time, though, he repeated his past assertions that this agreement was possible due to the "firmness and resolve of the West."

The President welcomed the processes of glasnost and restructuring in the Soviet Union. He followed this by lamenting that "the fundamentals of the structure of the system of the Soviet Union and the countries of Eastern Europe have not changed."

"We are ready to cooperate with the Soviets," Reagan stated, "ready to praise and criticize, improve contacts, and work for changes.... This is the way toward lasting peace, great freedom, and a safer planet."

Interview With OGONEK Cited

[8]05152888 Moscow in English to North America 2300 GMT 27 May 88

[Text] Soviet people will learn from President Reagan's interview in OGONEK today that he is looking forward with great anticipation to visiting Moscow, and in particular to talking with the people. The negotiations are important, says the President, but so is the opportunity to understand the other fellow's point of view.

The President was asked if his perception of the USSR has changed. He said he had noted some progress, such as the Soviet Government's commitment to withdraw from Afghanistan, resolution of individual human rights cases, and more open discussion of these issues. But he said he does not understand why the Soviet Government restricts the practice of religion and freedom of movement. Neither does he accept limitations on free speech.

On the future of mankind, the President said his vision was of a world free of war. A nuclear war cannot be won and should never be fought, but we must also keep in mind, he added, that arms agreements alone will not make the world safer. We must also deal with the core source of mistrust between our nations. This is why the Soviet-American dialogue must cover a broad agenda of human rights, regional and bilateral issues, as well as arms reductions.

Interviewed by Soviet TV

[8]05113588 Moscow Television Service in Russian GMT 28 May 88

[Interview with U.S. President Ronald Reagan in the Oval Office of the White House by Soviet television special correspondents Valentin Sergeyevich Zorin and Boris Kalyagin—recorded; Reagan speaks in English fading into Russian translation]

[Text] [Zorin] Hello, comrades. We are in the White House in Washington, the permanent residence of the head of the American state, in the Oval Office of the White House, the place where the presidents of the United States of America work.

President Reagan has received us in order to be interviewed by Soviet television, and since our time has been severely limited, I think we will move on to the questions.

Mr President, you are about to visit Moscow. This will be your first visit to our country. How do you feel about going to the Soviet Union and what do you expect from the scheduled summit meeting?

[Reagan] This will be the fourth meeting between the general secretary and me. I am obviously looking forward to the trip for one reason, because I have never been in your country. I wish to see as much as possible of it in the intervals between talks.

During the previous meetings we have discussed with the general secretary such questions as arms reduction. We have been successful in reaching agreement on one treaty and are presently working on the current treaty, which we call the START. This concerns a 50 percent reduction of intercontinental ballistic missiles. Also about the differences we had in understanding of human rights, and about regional issues. We are greatly heartened by the fact that your forces are being withdrawn from Afghanistan. We also discussed questions of bilateral relations, such as sea rescue, fishing agreements. On questions of this type we have achieved great progress.

[Kalyagin] Mr President, you and Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev have taken steps of great significance in Geneva, Reykjavik, and Washington. Thanks to this, the threat of war has decreased, cooperation between our countries is being put into practice. This is despite the differences in our social systems, different ideologies, and different views of the world. In your opinion, what are the possibilities for future progress along this path?

[Reagan] Well, I have to be optimistic about it. I have read the book Perestroyka from cover to cover, and the goals that were outlined there for your country by your present leader are such that I think it will reduce some of the differences between us in the future, and make it possible for the future leaders of our countries to establish that which I called for in our first meeting in Geneva, when I spoke to the general secretary face to face. I pointed out that we mistrusted each other not because we are armed, but that we were armed because we mistrust each other. The two of us have a unique opportunity not only to try to reduce arms, but to reduce reasons for the mistrust. I think that we have carried on in this spirit in our consequent meetings.

[Zorin] I would like to ask you, Mr President, what, in your opinion, is more important in the contemporary world: the power of might or the power of reason?

[Reagan] The power of reason. But I think this can be achieved quicker if we show our mutual desire for a peaceful world by getting rid of some of the horrendous types of weapons, such as the nuclear weapons. I made such a statement in the parliaments of one or two other countries several years ago and I have been repeating this since. I also heard a number of your specialists saying that a nuclear war cannot be won and must never be fought.

[Zorin] If we were to proceed from the premise that there must not be a nuclear war, then is there any sense to continue to manufacture weapons?

[Reagan] I think the most destabilizing weapons are the nuclear ones. People are scared that, when these weapons are fired, devastation will follow and there is no way to halt them. They are more destabilizing then the weapons which we already know—aircraft, warships, artillery. So I think that this is the immediate problem. Following this, if we can continue with the work to overcome our differences, and in reaching a better understanding between us, then, I think, we shall begin working towards reduction of conventional weapons.

[Kalyagin] Mr President, since we have already touched on the question of nuclear arms—I would not like to appear as a pessimist—but it appears that it is unlikely that an agreement on a 50 percent reduction of strategic nuclear weapons will be signed in Moscow, while adhering to the ABM Treaty. Nevertheless, in your opinion, what are the prospects of reaching this agreement, which is of paramount importance to the world.

[Reagan] I still think it can be reached. But it would be overly optimistic to imagine that, given the limited time, it will be ready for signature, as was the case of the INF Treaty here during the previous meeting. But we are going to continue negotiating. It would be nice if we could hold the signing ceremony during this visit. But the strategic weapons agreement is far more technically difficult then the agreement we have signed, and experts on both sides who were working on it in Geneva could not reach the same progress which was made in the preparation of the previous agreement. I am sure that they will continue, and I think that we shall be able to make progress during our talks and discussions in Moscow. The idea is to continue talks on the treaty until it is correct, and not just to sign an agreement by a certain date, which may not be consistent with all of our wishes.

[Kalyagin] Do you believe that this agreement will be signed?

[Reagan] Yes, I do. I don't think that either of us would have gone this far if we did not consider this idea to be good.

[Zorin] Mr President, I would like to ask you a somewhat personal question. Could you have imagined, at the start of your presidency, when you first entered this Oval Office, the likelihood of your forthcoming visit to Moscow?

[Reagan] Probably not. Because, very frankly, I have to say, there are differences between this general secretary and the other leaders of your country I had met in the past. I think they never had any plans for restructuring. Yet, I felt that we had to coexist in this world. Our systems are different, but we are going to be competitive in several directions. This will continue. But, we can compete without the hostility that could end in a conflict, and I think that this is exactly what we are aiming at. No, I could not have forseen your present leader.

[Zorin] New times give birth to new leaders.

[Reagan] Yes.

[Kalyagin] It could be concluded that you are counting on your successor continuing the course of stabilizing Soviet-American relations, that there will not be a pause in the dialogue between our countries?

[Reagan] If the next President is the President I would like to see in this position—the present Vice President—I know that he would continue on this track. I think that our people want this. I had a visit just the other day, here in the White House, from 78 teenagers. Half of them were from the Soviet Union and half were our own schoolchildren. They have been holding a conference in Finland, then in Moscow, and then here, in the United States. You look at these young people and you cannot say that these are Russians and these are Americans. You just see young people who had learned to know each

other, exchange ideas, get acquainted, and I found myself saying to them: If all the young people in the world could get to know each other, there will never be another war.

[Zorin] Mr President, I cannot but ask you a question which interests the Soviet public and many ordinary people in our country. In your speeches you have, on many occasions, quoted from Lenin's works, and have cited them. These quotes spoke of expansionist intentions of the Soviet Communists. Soviet specialists, and as I understand from the American press, qualified employees from the Library of Congress, have carefully searched all Lenin's works and failed to find even a single quote of this type, or anything that even comes close to it. Therefore, I would like ask you, what works of Lenin had you read, and where did you find the quotes you cited?

[Reagan] I do not think I can recall definitely where certain quotations were taken. I have lived a rather long life, and I am very much interested in the Soviet Union. I know from the things I studied in college, when I was working on my degree in economics and sociology, that Karl Marx declared in his doctrine, for example, that your system, communism, could only succeed when the whole world became communist and, in this way, approved creation of a single universal communist state. As I have said, I cannot recall all the sources from which I gleaned this. Some things may have been interpreted differently than in modern versions, but I know that Lenin developed this further, and said that this must be the goal. I also know—and there is no need to read Lenin to know this—that every leader, every general secretary, excluding the present one, when speaking at congresses, reiterated his adherence to this Marxist theory, that the goal is the creation of a universal communist state. The present leader has not said this. I did not invent anything, this is what we have been told. For example, we in this administration know that Lenin had a plan which involved a part of Latin America, and so on. One expression sounded particularly ominous to us. It was when he said that there would be no need to take the United States, the last bulwark of capitalism, by storm, that it would fall into our extended hands like a ripe fruit.

[Zorin] I would like to say that, according to the Bible, everyone wishes to go to Heaven. However, nobody proposes to use violence for this and to accelerate this process. Everything should go naturally. This is our point of view.

[Reagan] It is quite obvious that our two systems competed in the world with one another—in the economic sphere, in industry, and so forth. The differences are between our private ownership and state ownership of sources of raw materials, industry, and agriculture. Would you not think that it would make the most sense to compete on legal grounds, like the competition between businesses, and see who does the better job?

[Kalyagin] Unquestionably. When we say that we consider that, sooner or later, the world will come to socialism, we mean merely the historical process. Each country should decide for itself. We consider that capitalist and socialist countries should peacefully coexist on our same little planet and cooperate with each other.

[Reagan] Well, we believe that as well. But, there was a time when, as I said, we faced declarations on the part of communist philosophy on the necessity to take over and expand. As I said earlier, I think there is normal competition to find out which system is better.

Then, there is another place where we may disagree. This lies in our conviction that a people of a country has the right to determine the form of government to have. You have a Constitution, and we have a Constitution. The difference between our two constitutions is very simple. It is contained in three words. Both constitutions pronounce provisions for the welfare of people. Your Constitution says that these privileges and rights are granted by the Government to the people. Our Constitution says: We, the people, will allow the Government to do the following things, and the Government can do nothing which has not been defined in this Constitution by the people. This is why, when we encounter conflicts in countries where disturbances or dissent in respect to a government take place, our point of view is that the people should have the right to say: we want this kind of government; it should not be enforced.

[Zorin] In connection with this, I would like to say that democracy is a great goal for all peoples. But if we look specifically at public opinion in the United States today as indicated by polls, and at Congress, they oppose actions against Nicaragua, yet contrary to these sentiments, the administration acts in a different direction.

[Reagan] Yes, of course. You must remember that every congressman is elected by a district, his electoral district. I have the only job in our country which is elected by all the people. And herein lies the responsibility which the people entrust in this job. It says in the Constitution that the President is responsible for our national security, and this is a responsibility which he cannot shirk. He has the final word as to what is essential for national security. You were going to say something [gestures towards Kalyagin]

[Kalyagin] Yes, I wanted to say that—returning to the topic of coexistence between capitalist and socialist states—I want to recall that the concept of peaceful coexistence should be attributed precisely to Vladimir Ilich Lenin, our first leader.

But I would like to move to another issue. Quite often in your speeches, you dwell on a very important problem, the problem of human rights. As a rule, when you do this, you talk about the situation with human rights in other

countries. Today, I would like to ask you: As President of the United States, and as a U.S. citizen, are you satisfied with the state of human rights in your own country?

[Reagan] I think you could never be completely satisfied. It is natural for people to have prejudices, but we have laws in our country in accordance with which the realization of these prejudices and attempts at injustice to other people is a violation of the law. You must remember a great distinction peculiar to our country. A person wrote to me about this once in a letter. It lies in the fact that one can live here, then go and live in France. But you cannot become French. Or you could go and live in Germany or Turkey, name any country, but you could not become one of them. Our country is the only country in the world to which any person from any corner of the world can come and become an American, because this is our history. We came from every corner of the world. When you meet a group of Americans—ask those gathered here around the U.S. President—ask them about their origins, about their forefathers, and so forth. You will have quite a collection. As far as I am concerned, my origins—if you talk about grandfathers and great grandfathers, grandmothers and great grandmothers—they came from four countries, different countries. But everything merged here. The result was that the people who came here did not come only with a desire for freedom, they also brought many prejudices with them which existed due to national differences between various countries, and we had to take this into consideration.

So human rights here are defended. People may have, and do have, prejudices against others with different religions, origins, or race. But, if they do anything to hurt this person because of these prejudices, the law takes care of it.

[Zorin] I think a lot has been said about human rights recently, therefore I would like to ask you a question concerning your forthcoming visit to Moscow. Mr President, I do not want to elicit any secrets from you, but could we learn what you are carrying to Moscow in your diplomatic briefcase and what you would like to take home from there?

[Reagan, laughs] Well, as I said earlier, the same questions that we spoke about before. Basically these concern four major areas. Yes, it is what we spoke about. I recognize that one country cannot dictate to another how to conduct its affairs. But, it is possible that some of the things we shall talk about, on the basis of our experience, may be helpful. For example, in the sphere of human rights.

Quite recently I followed, with great interest, the General Secretary's meeting with the leaders of your Orthodox Church. This meeting has loosened some of the restrictions imposed by the Government against the supporters of this religion. I wondered if there would be a further expansion of this. You see, our country came into being because people in other countries were denied the right to worship God. And so they left their countries and came here as pioneers in order to worship. I wondered if there was not room in your country for more glasnost and tolerance for people to profess their religion as they choose. Here we call it separation of church and state. The Government cannot deny people the right to worship, just as the churches cannot impose their convictions on the Government.

[Zorin] I think the topic of human rights really does deserve broad discussion and, in connection with this, I would like to ask you this question: Recently, General Stroessner, the dictator from Paraguay, visited Washington. I read about it in the U.S. press. When you meet Soviet leaders—and this occurred in Geneva, Reykjavik, and Washington—you always raise the topic of human rights. This is probably right. Now, do you discuss this topic with General Stroessner, with the leaders of Chile, South Korea, and South Africa? Does the topic of human rights figure in your discussions?

[Reagan] Oh yes, there is no question that, in our relations with these countries, this is one of the issues. For one reason, because of the background of all of our people. Public opinion influences the Government. In Congress and in the Presidential office we must, as you noted earlier, do what corresponds with the people's needs, the people's wishes. When we aspire to be neighbors and friends of another country, while that country subjects people to imprisonment simply for expressing political differences or because they want to be believers, there are many people in our country whose roots are in these countries. You must remember that, although we are all Americans, a person does not give up his love for his mother simply because he has married. The people in our country continue to feel ties and kinship with the countries of their forefathers or their own countries if they came here recently.

One out of every eight Americans has roots in your region. These people can rise up and oppose us in some deal which we would like to conclude, if they consider that the country of their forefathers is being unfair in denying human rights. Maybe in your country not as much significance is attached to public opinion. But here, it is the very basis of our system. We can agree on things and conclude agreements with far greater success with one another as governments if our people do not rebel against something being undertaken by your Government.

[Kalyagin] You will be in Moscow soon, and I think you will have an opportunity to familiarize yourself with how public opinion works in the Soviet Union, and what freedom of religion is like in our country.

[Zorin] I would like, in conclusion, since our time is running out, to ask you a personal question, Mr President. Most presidents in this country, on conclusion of

their term in office, devote themselves to memoirs. Are you preparing to write your memoirs and when will we be able to acquaint ourselves with them if they appear?

[Reagan, laughs] Well, I have been thinking very seriously about writing a book, taking into consideration the fact that several people who have left the Government have written a number of books. It could be that I should continue, and describe how things really were. It is possible that I shall write a book. But, you must remember that in our country there is another thing which has become a tradition. People, not governments, voluntarily donate money and means to build what is known as a presidential library and museum. This is happening in my case. The job is already under way. There is a group in the country which has collected millions of dollars. A building will be erected in California and in it will be millions of documents from the present Administration. They will be open. Scientists can come and study them, carry out research, and so forth. There will also be a lot of interesting things for people, memorabilia that we have collected here. This has happened with all presidents in recent years. There will also be a history of the administration's work, which will be open to the public. I shall probably get around to writing a book, but I am not sure of this. Once, I began writing a book and found that it was quite a chore.

[Zorin] Well, since our time has run out, it remains for me to thank you for this interview and to wish you great success in the forthcoming mission. Thank you, Mr President.

[Reagan] Thank you very much. I would also like to say before visiting your country, it would give me great pleasure to say a few words about something that is hardly ever discussed. I have the greatest admiration for the women of the Soviet Union, particularly in the areas where Russians live. From the outside looking in, they seem to be a great support, strength, and reliability in keeping the home, in that they stand in lines and bring home what is necessary for the family. I just wonder if they are given credit in your country. I think they deserve it.

[Kalyagin] They deserve it. They not only stand in line, but the overwhelming majority of them work with the men. They teach, care for children, participate in the administration, and I hope you will be able to see all this with your own eyes when you visit our country.

[Reagan] You have said it better than I did. Yes, I recognize all this, and simply wanted to know if they enjoy recognition in their own country for all that they do.

[Zorin] Once more, thank you very much, Mr President, for this interesting interview.

[Reagan] I am happy to welcome you and it was a great pleasure and I highly appreciate the opportunity to address your people.

[Kalyagin] Thank you.

Reagan Departs Helsinki

905090988 Moscow TASS in English 0905 GMT 29 May 88

[Text] Helsinki May 29 TASS—U.S. President Ronald Reagan left here today for Moscow.

In keeping with an earlier understanding, he will pay an official visit to the Soviet Union.

At the Helsinki Airport, Ronald Reagan and the accompanying U.S. delegation were seen off by President Mauno Koivisto of Finland and other officials.

Reagan Moscow Arrival, 29 May Activities Noted

Gromyko Welcomes Reagan

905101188 Moscow TASS in English 1004 GMT 29 May 88

[Text] Moscow May 29 TASS—President Ronald Reagan of the United States arrived here today on an official visit.

The fourth meeting between the general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, Mikhail Gorbachev, and President Ronald Reagan will be held in Moscow from May 29 to June 2.

At Vnukovo Airport Ronald Reagan and his wife were greeted on the tarmac by member of the Political Bureau of the CPSU Central Committee, President of the Presidium of the USSR Supreme Soviet Andrey Gromyko and his wife, member of the Political Bureau of the CPSU Central Committee, Minister of Foreign Affairs of the USSR Eduard Shevardnadze, Secretary of the CPSU Central Committee Anatoliy Dobrynin and the ambassador of the USSR in the United States, Yuriy Dubinin.

More on Airport Welcoming

905125088 Moscow TASS in English 1147 GMT 29 May 88

[Text] Moscow May 29 TASS—The Soviet capital today welcomed the President of the United States Ronald Reagan with traditional Moscow hospitality. His official visit to the Soviet Union has begun.

This is the first visit to the USSR by the 40th President of the United States and it ends a fourteen-year interval in official visits by American heads of state to Moscow.

As in their time the meetings in Geneva, Reykjavik and Washington, the present one also is in the centre of attention of the world. Everybody hopes that Moscow of

late May and early June 1988, a wonderful time of Russian summer, will become yet another milestone distancing us from mistrust and confrontation and bringing us closer to mutual understanding and cooperation, to a nuclear-free and a just world.

Two p.m. Moscow time. The guard of honour is lined up on the tarmac of Vnukovo Airport. The stars and stripes and the red Soviet flag flutter on tall masts.

A streamer on the airport building reads in Russian and English "Welcome, Mr. President".

The welcoming party warmly greets the President of the United States. The first handshakes after the President and Nancy Reagan step down on the tarmac. They are greeted by Member of the Political Bureau of the CPSU Central Committee, President of the Presidium of the Supreme Soviet of the USSR Andrey Gromyko and his wife, Member of the Political Bureau of the CPSU Central Committee, Minister of Foreign Affairs of the USSR Eduard Shevardnadze, Secretary of the CPSU Central Committee Anatoliy Dobrynin and the USSR Ambassador in the United States Yuriy Dubinin.

The U.S. President is being accompanied by Secretary of State George Shultz and other American officials.

Nancy Reagan is presented a big bouquet of red roses.

Andrey Gromyko and Ronald Reagan walk to the guard of honour representing the three services of the Soviet Armed Forces.

Near the banner of the Armed Forces of the USSR the commander of the guard of honour presents the guard of honour to the President of the United States.

The national anthems of the two countries are played by a military band.

Andrey Gromyko and Ronald Reagan bow to the banner of the Armed Forces of the USSR and then inspect the guard of honour.

Then the Soviet officials who arrived for the welcome at the airport were introduced to the President.

Among them were Yan Vagris, vice president of the Presidium of the USSR Supreme Soviet, Yuriy Khristoradnov, chairman of the Soviet of the Union of the USSR Supreme Soviet, Vladimir Kamentsev and Boris Tolstykh, deputy chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers, Tengiz Menteshashvili, secretary of the Presidium of the USSR Supreme Soviet, Yuriy Volmer, Vasiliy Zakharov, Konstantin Katushev and Nikolay Kotlyar, ministers of the USSR, Valeriy Saykin, chairman of the Executive Committee of the Moscow City Soviet, and Aleksandr Bessmertnykh, deputy foreign minister of the USSR. [Moscow Television Service in Russian at 0958 GMT on 29 May carries a live relay from Vnukovo Airport of President Reagan's arrival. An announcer notes that the welcoming party included Gromyko, Shevardnadze, Demichev, Yazov, Dobrynin.]

The President greets the diplomatic staff of the U.S. Embassy in the USSR, headed by Ambassador Jack Matlock.

Reagan and his wife are greeted with little flags bearing national colours by representatives of the capital's working people.

The welcoming ceremony in the airport ends with the march-past of the guard of honour.

The motorcade, escorted by motorcycle outriders, heads after a few minutes to the city. There are hundreds of state flags of the United States and the Soviet Union and welcome streamers along the route.

Reagans Tour Historic Street

[redacted]905164988 Moscow TASS in English 1630 GMT 29 May 88

[Text] Moscow May 29 TASS—The acquaintance of President Ronald Reagan of the United States and his wife Nancy with the Soviet capital was continued today on the Arbat, one of Moscow's old streets.

The distinguished guests had to abandon their cars because the street the length of which is not more than one kilometre is a pedestrian precinct.

Several years ago all traffic had been removed from the street, and asphalt surface had been replaced with cobblestone one. Beautiful lamps had been installed along the mansions in the empire style, and the Arbat had regained the look it had had several centuries ago.

The President and his wife saw that this nook of the Soviet capital is the favourite haunt of musicians, artists, poets and singers, and simply people who are fond of unhurried strolls and heart-to-heart talks. The distinguished American guests, too, availed themselves of this opportunity. They were instantly surrounded by affable Muscovites. The U.S. President was in high spirits, smiled, and looked very spry.

Judging by everything, the guests liked the ten minute stroll along the "Moscow Montmartre", the stroll which was not envisioned by the official programme.

Gorbachev Welcomes Reagan

[redacted]905112488 Moscow TASS in English 1111 GMT 29 May 88

[Text] Moscow May 29 TASS—A welcoming ceremony for U.S. President Ronald Reagan and his wife was held in the St. George's Hall of the Grand Kremlin Palace today.

They were met by Mikhail Gorbachev and his wife in the center of the hall.

The accompanying officials then exchanged handshakes and greetings as well.

A pool of photographers, newsreel makers and TV crews recorded the ceremony on film.

The Soviet and U.S. leaders exchanged brief speeches of greeting.

Further on Gorbachev Greeting

[illegible]905160588 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian [illegible]May 88 First Edition p 1

[TASS report under the general headline: "Official Visit"]

[Excerpt] [Passage omitted] The official meeting ceremony for R. Reagan took place in the Grand Kremlin Palace. The U.S. President was greeted warmly by M.S. Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee.

M.S. Gorbachev and his wife met R. Reagan and his wife in the center of the hall. Dozens of Soviet and foreign photographers and cameramen recorded their handshake on film. The entire proceedings in the historic hall were televised to many countries of the world.

The general secretary addressed a speech of welcome to the U.S. President. [passage omitted]

Gorbachev Kremlin Speech Reported

[illegible]905124288 Moscow Television Service in Russian [illegible]1056 GMT 29 May 88

[Speech by Mikhail Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, at welcoming ceremony for President Reagan in the Georgiyevskiy Zal of the Kremlin—live; Gorbachev speaks in Russian with passage-by-passage translation into English; translated from the Russian]

[Text] Esteemed Mr Ronald Reagan, President of the United States of America. Esteemed Mrs Nancy Reagan. On behalf of the people and the Government, I welcome you sincerely on the occasion of your visit to the Soviet Union. Welcome. Almost half a year has already passed since the time of our meeting in Washington which has gone down in history as a major milestone in Soviet-U.S. and in international relations.

Now you, Mr President, have in your turn, overcome the great distance that divides our capitals so as to continue our political dialogue, and we duly appreciate this. This is the fourth meeting and it already enables a large-scale assessment of certain things. We think that long-established antipathies have been shaken and the familiar stereotypes linked to the image of an enemy have lost their staunchness. The human features of the other people have become more visible.

This is important in itself, for, on the border between two millenia, history has objectively linked our countries by a joint responsibility for the destinies of mankind. The peoples of the world, and primarily the Soviet and American peoples, welcome the positive changes in our relations that have been observed and expect your visit and the talks to be fruitful and to give a new impetus in all directions of the dialogue and interaction of the two great states.

You and I are aware of the strivings of our peoples for mutual understanding, cooperation, and a safe, stable world. This obliges us to discuss constructively the main aspects of disarmament. The set of issues related to strategic offensive arms reductions of 50 percent in conditions of preserving the ABM Treaty of 1972, the elimination of chemical weapons, cutting back troops and conventional weapons in Europe, and stopping nuclear tests. The world is waiting for responsible judgements from you, Mr President, and from myself, on other complex issues of modern times as well, such as settling regional conflicts, improving international economic relations, promoting development, and triumphing over backwardness, poverty, mass diseases, and humanitarian problems. And, of course, we will be discussing bilateral links.

Our previous meetings have shown that constructive relations between the USSR and the United States can be attained. The treaty on intermediate- and shorter-range missiles is the most impressive symbol of this. But even more complex and important tasks lie ahead.

And so, you and I, Mr President, have a great deal of work ahead of us, and it is good that there is a lot of work, and the peoples need that work. We are ready to do as much as possible over these coming days in Moscow. You, Mr President, and Mrs Reagan, have arrived for the first time in the Soviet Union, about which you have often spoken in your statements. Knowing your interest in Russian sayings, I would like to add another one to your collection; It is better to see something once than to hear it a hundred times.

I can assure you that you will find here hospitality, warmth, and goodwill. You will be having a lot of meetings with Soviet people. They have a centuries-old history behind them. They love their land and take pride in their accomplishments. They are not happy about the things that are at present standing in their way and they have heated discussions about and seek ways in which their homeland can progress. They are full of plans for the future.

Being ardent patriots, the Soviet people are open to friendship and cooperation with all peoples and have sincere respect for the American people, and want good relations with your country.

Here within the walls of the ancient Kremlin, where one comes into contact with actual history, people cannot help but reflect over the diversity and greatness of human civilization.

So, let the Soviet-U.S. talks here acquire a greater historical depth; may they be imbued with the sense that they are participant in mankind's common destiny.

Once again I bid you welcome.

Reagan Replies

[redacted]905130188 Moscow World Service in English [redacted] GMT 29 May 88

[Speech by President Ronald Reagan on arrival at the Georgiyevskiy Zal in the Kremlin—live]

[Text] Mr General Secretary, Mrs Gorbachev: Mr General Secretary, thank you for those kind words of welcome. We've traveled a long road together to reach this moment from our first meeting in Geneva in November 1985, when I invited you to visit me in Washington and you invited me to Moscow.

It was cold that day in Geneva, and even colder in Reykjavik when we met the following year to work on the preparations for our exchange of visits. We faced great obstacles but by the time of your visit to Washington last December, although we still had to grapple with difficult issues, we had achieved impressive progress in all the areas of our common agenda—human rights, regional issues, arms reduction, and our bilateral relations.

We signed a treaty that will reduce the level of nuclear arms for the first time in history, by eliminating an entire class of U.S. and Soviet independent-range [as heard] missiles. We agreed on the main points of a treaty that would cut in half our arsenals of strategic offensive nuclear arms. We agreed to conduct a joint experiment that would allow us to develop effective ways to verify limits on nuclear testing. We held full and frank discussions that planted the seeds for future progress.

It is almost summer, and some of those seeds are beginning to bear fruit thanks to the hard work we have both done since our last meeting, including monthly meetings by our foreign ministers and the first meeting of our defense ministers. [Moscow Television Service in Russian at 1107 GMT on 29 May carries President Reagan's speech at the welcoming ceremony with General Secretary Gorbachev in the Kremlin. The address, which is broadcast live, is accompanied by a passage-by-passage translation into Russian. Here, the Russian translation quotes Reagan as saying: "It is almost summer, and some of those seeds are already producing shoots thanks to the hard work we have both done...."]

We have signed the Geneva accords providing for the withdrawal of all Soviet troops from Afghanistan, and the first withdrawals have begun. We and our allies have completed technical arrangements necessary to begin implementing the INF Treaty as soon as it enters into force.

For the next major step in arms control—reductions in U.S. and Soviet strategic offensive arsenals—our negotiators in Geneva have produced hundreds of pages of joint draft treaty text recording our areas of agreement as well as those issues yet to be resolved.

Our new nuclear-risk reduction centers have begun their transmissions of routine notifications to reduce the risk of conflict. [Here the Moscow television translation renders Reagan's words as follows: "Our new nuclear-risk reduction centers have begun their transmissions of routine notifications to reduce the risk of nuclear conflict."] Our scientists are installing the equipment for our joint experiment to verify limits on nuclear testing. Our experts have held broad-ranging discussions on human rights and important steps have been taken in that area.

We have greatly expanded our bilateral exchanges since we signed our agreement in 1985. I hope you'll agree with me that more of our young people need to participate in these exchanges, which can do so much to lay the basis for greater mutual understanding in the next generation.

I could go on. The list of accomplishments goes far beyond what many anticipated, but I think the message is clear. Despite clear and fundamental differences and despite the inevitable frustrations that we have encountered, our work has begun to produce results.

In the past, Mr General Secretary, you've taken note of my liking for Russian proverbs, and in order not to disappoint anyone on this visit I thought I would mention a literary saying from your past, another example of your people's succinct wisdom. [Reagan utters phrase in Russian] It was born, it wasn't rushed.

Mr General Secretary, we did not rush, we have taken our work step-by-step, and I have come here to continue that work. We both know it will not be easy. We both know that there are tremendous hurdles yet to be overcome.

But, we also know that it can be done because we share a common goal, strengthening the framework we have already begun to build for a relationship that we can sustain over the long term, a relationship that will bring genuine benefit to our own peoples and to the world. Thank you, and God bless you.

Reagan, Gorbachev Answer Questions

[redacted]905145088 Moscow TASS in English 1407 GMT 29 May 88

[Text] Moscow May 29 TASS—Mikhail Gorbachev and Ronald Reagan had a one-on-one meeting in the Grand Kremlin Palace's Catherine Hall today shortly after the U.S. President arrived in Moscow on an official visit.

But before the two leaders began their talks in private, newsmen were able to ask them a few questions.

One reporter asked Reagan how he liked being in what he had once called an "evil empire".

"Just fine and everyone has been making me feel very comfortable," Reagan replied.

Another member of the press corps asked him if he was posing as a teacher on human rights.

"I have no intention trying to be a teacher," was the reply.

Gorbachev was asked, for his part what he thought on the proverb "It was born, it wasn't rushed" used by the U.S. President in his speech in the St. George's Hall at the welcoming ceremony.

"I'm always for progress. It shouldn't be too rushed, but it should be progress, constant and steady and going forward. That was a good proverb, but I like the other one better, 'trust but verify'," Gorbachev answered.

Another question to him was if a fifth summit that would complete work on a strategic arms reduction was possible.

"It's quite possible." Gorbachev said.

Reagan-Gorbachev Talks Begin

[redacted]905120988 Moscow TASS in English 1206 GMT 29 May 88

[Text] Moscow May 29 TASS—A one-on-one meeting between Mikhail Gorbachev and Ronald Reagan has started in Catherine's Hall of the Grand Kremlin Palace.

Reagan Describes Talks

[redacted]905183088 Moscow TASS in English 1737 GMT 29 May 88

[Text] Moscow May 29 TASS—U.S. President Ronald Reagan has pointed to a congenial character of his first conversation with Mikhail Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, the presidential assistant for press relations told a briefing here today.

Both leaders agreed that considerable progress had been achieved over the past few years in Soviet-American relations, and no new problems emerged in discussions, Marlin Fitzwater said.

The White House spokesman said that the President congratulated the general secretary upon the start of the Soviet troop withdrawal from Afghanistan.

Asked by a TASS correspondent about subjects to be discussed by the leaders of the two countries and whether they would be limited to human rights, Fitzwater replied that issues of arms reduction would be central to the discussions.

Referring to the ratification of the INF Treaty by the American Senate and the USSR Supreme Soviet, he observed that the issue of the 50 per cent reduction of the strategic offensive arsenals was more intricate for discussion than the INF Treaty.

This question would be examined not only by the U.S. President and the general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, but also by working groups, he said.

Upon the completion of the summit meeting, the journalists would be told about the results of this discussion, Fitzwater pointed out.

Gerasimov Characterizes Talks

[redacted]905175088 Moscow TASS in English 1734 GMT 29 May 88

[Text] Moscow May 29 TASS—"The first meeting between Mikhail Gorbachev and Ronald Reagan lasted one hour 11 minutes and was held in a serious and businesslike spirit and in a well-wishing atmosphere," said Gennadiy Gerasimov, head of the Information Directorate of the USSR Ministry of Foreign Affairs.

He spoke today at the first joint Soviet-U.S. briefing at the summit press centre. The briefing was attended by about 1,500 correspondents who cover this major event.

At today's first meeting of the two leaders, special attention was devoted to reviewing what had been achieved from the viewpoint of improving Soviet-American relations. Our side emphasized, Gennadiy Gerasimov said, that the Geneva, Reykjavik and Washington summits constituted the lessons of how to live in peace, to build bilateral relations on the basis of the balance of interests, and to resolve all problems politically.

Having recalled that the INF Treaty had been ratified by the USSR Supreme Soviet and the U.S. Senate, the Soviet spokesman pointed out that the two countries had also achieved certain progress in drafting a treaty on a 50-per cent reduction in strategic offensive arms. He said that, apart from the leaders of the Soviet Union and the United States, diplomats were beginning to work today and working groups were being set up.

With a view to stimulating the search for new forms of cooperation, the spokesman for the USSR Ministry of Foreign Affairs went on to say, the Soviet side suggested to the U.S. one to think of joint exploration of Mars, including arrangements for a future joint space flight to the planet. "We feel that the President agreed attentively to study and consider the proposal."

Questions of humanitarian nature, of human rights were discussed as well. The exchange of views was in-depth, and the Soviet side expressed supposition that President Ronald Reagan did not have a sufficiently clear idea of the state of affairs in this field in the USSR. "It seems to us," Gennadiy Gerasimov said, "that the estimates with which the President approaches the human rights situation in the USSR stem from the past and do not take into account the current state of affairs".

In this connection the spokesman for the USSR Ministry of Foreign Affairs said that the Soviet Union likewise had quite a number of questions concerning the human rights situation in the United States. In order to gain a better understanding of this matter, the Soviet side suggests organizing something like a seminar within the framework of inter-parliamentary contacts so that the parliamentarians of the two countries could meet and discuss both specific problems which give rise to concern and more general matters.

The head of the Information Directorate of the USSR Ministry of Foreign Affairs emphasized that the first meeting between the leaders of the two countries set a good beginning of the summit and that the two sides were pleased with it.

Shultz Notes 'Good Beginning'

[illegible]905211788 Moscow TASS in English 2111 GMT [illegible] May 88

[Text] Washington May 30 TASS—U.S. Secretary of State George Shultz, speaking the CBS "Face the Nation" program, described the first meeting between Mikhail Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, and U.S. President Ronald Reagan during the summit as cordial and businesslike.

Mr Shultz said that, to his mind, that was on the whole a good beginning. He voiced confidence that the two sides intended to try to reach progress in the extensive working agenda.

Baker Reacts to First Round

[illegible]005062488 Moscow TASS in English 0521 GMT [illegible] May 88

[Text] New York May 30 TASS—White House Chief of Staff Howard Baker said in an NBC interview that the first one-on-one meeting between Mikhail Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, and U.S. President Ronald Reagan on Sunday covered "a wide range of things."

The two leaders, he said, discussed "a range of issues all the way from perhaps joint space ventures to aspects of regional conflicts." There were no surprises at the meeting, Baker continued. "But the real importance was that these two men have developed the ability to communicate and to communicate extensively and, I think, freely between each other...They understand each other remarkably well." Howard Baker characterized Mikhail Gorbachev and Ronald Reagan as people "who are very capable at identifying and protecting the rights of their respective countries", adding that that was the best superpower relationship people could have. "The general impression I have is that the President was pleased with the meeting. There is a lot of hard work ahead. But I think it's going to be a good summit," he said.

Meeting in 'Spirit of Goodwill'

[illegible]005064788 Moscow TASS in English 1030 GMT [illegible] May 88

[Text] Moscow May 30 TASS—Mikhail Gorbachev and Ronald Reagan, who arrived in the Soviet capital yesterday on an official visit to continue Soviet-American dialogue, began their second meeting here today.

It is taking place in the Catherine Hall at the Grand Kremlin Palace, a traditional venue for meetings between Soviet leaders and high-ranking delegations from different countries. It is there that talks with Richard Nixon were held in their time.

The first Gorbachev-Reagan meeting at the current summit took place Sunday. It lasted for one hour and eleven minutes and, it was disclosed at a Soviet-U.S. joint press briefing last night, was held "in a serious and businesslike atmosphere and a spirit of goodwill".

Roundup of Day One

[illegible]005102588 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian [illegible] May 88 Second Edition p 6

[Article by G. Vasilyev and N. Kurdyumov: "Day One"]

[Text] Being involved in historic events makes one excited and puts one in a festive mood. All the more so if these events are taking place in a venue whose very walls breathe history. The snow-white vaulted ceilings of St. George's Hall in the Great Kremlin Palace are magnificent and graceful. The chandeliers bathe the hall in cascades of light. One's gaze inevitably lingers on the memorial plaques on the walls: The names of battles and regiments famed for their military feats are carved in gold letters on marble.

The very atmosphere of the Kremlin and its historic halls and cathedrals makes people ponder the wealth and diversity of mankind's cultural birthright and the different paths chosen by history. And this feeling leads to another thought: We must do everything to preserve our vivid, colorful, and polyglot world and rid it of the threat of nuclear destruction.

The sky behind the high windows was bright blue. The domes of the cathedrals were a blaze of gold. After the welcoming ceremony in St. George's Hall, when our important [vysokiy] guest and his wife had moved to St. Catherine's Hall—where there was a photo-call before the start of the first conversation—one of the foreign journalists, despite the warning that "this is not a press conference," started asking the U.S. President and the general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee questions. These included the following question to Reagan: "How do you feel about being in the center of the 'evil empire?'" Someone laughed. The journalist was clearly alluding ironically to one of the U.S. President's previous statements about the Soviet Union. Reagan's answer was along the lines that he felt pretty good.

It was an amusing episode. But there was something more to it. Once, on taking office as U.S. President, Ronald Reagan at the start of his presidency did not stint on dark epithets with regard to the USSR. Some of this phraseology—and not only the phraseology—has remained with the current U.S. Administration to this day. But what striking changes! The two countries are conducting a businesslike and constructive dialogue. The treaty on intermediate- and shorter-range missiles—the first-ever agreement to eliminate nuclear weapons—has already been signed and ratified. And now the U.S. President is in Moscow—the third-ever visit to our capital by a U.S. head of state and Government.

We recall all this not to cast a stone of reproach. Quite the contrary. We want to pay tribute to a politician's ability to change with changing circumstances. We would like to hope that this conceals not just an ability to maneuver in search of votes (for "his" Republican Party) but also an ability to discard obsolete ideas for the sake of progress. And this is very important. After all, the problems facing the participants in the present summit are also major: new steps along the road of disarmament, the expansion and enrichment of bilateral relations, the settlement of regional conflicts, and the improvement of the position regarding human rights.

Currently the attention of the entire world's public is veritably riveted on Moscow and the meeting between the two countries' leaders. An "assault force" of many thousands of representatives of all the mass media has descended on the Soviet capital to cover the visit. More than 5,000 journalists from 63 countries, including more than 1,000 from the United States, are accredited at the Soviet-U.S. summit press center.

The stream of reports which they are currently filing to their countries note that the fourth summit in the last 3 years—following Geneva, Reykjavik, and Washington—is an event which clearly reflects the changes taking place in the international arena and expresses the hope that new steps will be taken to further develop the consistent and constructive policy of ensuring lasting peace and nuclear disarmament.

Calling the Moscow meeting with Gorbachev the "swan song of Reagan's foreign policy," Helen Thomas, UPI correspondent at the White House, noted that the President will discover that this trip will widen his outlook and he may even agree with the Russian proverb that "you must see with your own eyes" to know the truth. "If the only constant in our world," H. Thomas concluded, "is change, the superpowers are moving into a new political stage in recognizing the necessity for coexistence on our planet."

REUTERS correspondent Tony Barber wrote in turn that U.S. officials see the summit as a "chance to assess the progress that has been achieved" in Soviet-U.S. relations, and he went on to note that: "Reagan has said that he will use the meeting to hand on to his successor stable relations" between the United States and the USSR.

In the evening there was a joint press conference chaired by G. Gerasimov, chief of the USSR Foreign Ministry Information Administration, and M. Fitzwater, White House press spokesman. Journalists were briefed on the first meeting between M.S. Gorbachev and R. Reagan, which was held in a serious, businesslike, and amicable atmosphere. All the main questions on the agenda for the current summit were discussed in general terms at the meeting. The meeting's participants, the USSR Foreign Ministry spokesman said, know each other well, and consequently the talk immediately got down to essentials. It was noted that many things had been achieved during the previous meetings and both sides had acquired experience in resolving questions through political means on the basis of a balance of interests.

In order to discuss humanitarian problems, the Soviet side proposed setting up a seminar-type working organ in which USSR Supreme Soviet deputies and members of the U.S. Congress could meet on equal terms. Unfortunately, G. Gerasimov said, obsolete ideas about the human rights position in the USSR—ideas which take no account of the changes taking place in our country—prevail on the U.S. side. For our part we could also say a great deal about the human rights position in the United States. The White House spokesman stressed that the U.S. President will welcome any proposals to promote the improvement of mutual understanding.

Reagan Activities, Meetings of 30 May Reported

Second Day of Talks Opens

LD005061188 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 0000 GMT 30 May 88

[Text] Today is the second day of U.S. President Ronald Reagan's official visit to the Soviet Union. On the agenda are two conversations between the leaders of the USSR and United States. The first has just begun.

The President will visit Danilov Monastery today and meet representatives of the public in his residence.

In the evening a dinner will be given in the Faceted Palace of the Great Kremlin Hall in honor of Ronald Reagan.

Gorbachev Remarks Highlighted

0005122988 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1130 GMT 30 May 88

[Announcer-read report from the "Novosti" newscast; passages within quotation marks videorecorded]

[Text] Hello, comrades. Today is the 2d day of U.S. President Ronald Reagan's official visit to the USSR. [video shows presidential motorcade on Moscow streets] Soviet-U.S. talks opened in the Great Kremlin Palace this morning. In line with tradition, Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev and Ronald Reagan answered questions from correspondents before the talks. [video shows following officials standing at a table, from left to right: Dubinin, Yakovlev, Dobrynin, Gromyko, Gorbachev, Reagan, Shultz, Shevardnadze, unidentified man, Matlock, unidentified woman, Yazov] Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev said in particular:

[Gorbachev] "We are getting the impression that, perhaps, we—both you and us—do not have a very good idea of the real situation with human rights, either in the Soviet Union or in the United States. I have told the President: Let us set up a standing seminar within the framework of parliamentary exchanges where information and assessments could be exchanged. In my view, that would be good, all right."

In his turn, President Reagan noted a considerable degree of progress in the area of human rights in the Soviet Union. [video shows Gorbachev and Reagan speaking]

[Gorbachev] "I think that everything we have done in recent years to improve our relations through joint efforts—relations between our countries and peoples—and the things we will do now answer the fundamental interests of the Soviet and American peoples, and, I hope, the interests of the peoples of all countries. I wish the Americans peace and prosperity. We are ready to cooperate." [video shows officials taking their seats at a table, with the Soviet side shown, from left to right: unidentified man, Dobrynin, Yakovlev, Chernyayev, unidentified man]

The Soviet-U.S. talks in the Kremlin continue. Our peoples and all of mankind expect the Moscow summit to become a new milestone in the development of Soviet-U.S. cooperation, and in progress toward disarmament and a just, nuclear-free world.

Visit to Danilov Monastery

0005120388 Moscow TASS in English 1137 GMT May 88

[Text] Moscow May 30 TASS—President Ronald Reagan of the United States today was a guest of the Danilov Monastery, the spiritual and administrative centre of the Russian Orthodox Church and official residence of the patriarch and the Holy Synod.

The President's black limousine drove into the monastery's courtyard and from there, to the chimes of church bells, Ronald Reagan walked to the Cathedral of the Intercession where he was greeted by Metropolitan Filaret of Minsk and Belorussia, who heads the Department of External Church Relations of the Moscow Patriarchate. The President was also greeted by the dean of the monastery Archimandrite Tikhon.

Addressing the guest, Metropolitan Filaret said that "on the blessing of the Patriarch of Moscow and All Russia Pimen I have the honour together with the dean of the monastery and the monks to welcome you at Moscow's Danilov Monastery. This monastery was founded in the 13th century by Prince Danil. In Russia monasteries have always been centres of spiritual life, spiritual culture and education. At the same time they were outposts of national independence".

The metropolitan said that at present the Russian Orthodox Church had 22 monasteries and that at present the Russian Orthodox Church was preparing to extensively celebrate the millenium of its historic existence.

Touching on the present life of the church the metropolitan said, "today the clergy and the people are united and thank God for His blessings. We also thank the government of our country for the attention with which it is solving internal problems, among them those concerning the life of our church. I will name only the latest sign of this attention. Sacred relics that were preserved in the Kremlin museums have been handed over to us".

"Alas, the rigid framework of your visit's protocol prevents us from familiarising you extensively with our life", Metropolitan Filaret went on. "But we rejoice that today you are meeting face to face with the Russian Orthodox Church and bearing witness to its full-blooded existence".

"At this moment the churches in our countries are praying for the success of your meeting with Mikhail Gorbachev", the church leader stressed. "You probably have the joint message that we sent to you and Mikhail Gorbachev. We bless your visit to the holy church and wholeheartedly wish you and your wife, as well as the entire American people, peace and prosperity".

The Danilov Monastery is now living through a new period of its history. It was closed for half a century and all its structures were used for other than religious

purposes. In 1983, responding to a request of the patriarch of Moscow and All Russia, the Soviet Government handed over the entire ensemble of the monastery with all its structures and the adjacent Cathedral of the Glorious Resurrection to the Russian Orthodox Church. Also adopted then was the decision to make the monastery the spiritual and administrative centre of the Russian Orthodox Church and the seat of the official residence of the patriarch and the Holy Synod.

Accompanied by Metropolitan Filaret and Archimandrite Tikhon the President of the United States entered the Cathedral of the Intercession. It was the first to be restored in the monastery and services are being conducted in it for already more than four years. Then Ronald Reagan went to the Cathedral of the Holy Fathers of the Seven Ecumenical Councils. The walls of this cathedral stand on the foundation of structures built in the 16th century. In all, there are already eight functioning churches in the monastery. The monastery's Church of the Holy Trinity was built by the famous Russian architect Osip Bove.

A week from now the Danilov Monastery will play host to the participants in the celebrations of the millenium of the baptism of Russia.

During his brief stay in the monastery the distinguished guest was shown remarkable icons. Some of them were created by modern artists working at the Danilov Monastery and the Trinity-St. Sergius Monastery. Their creativity is closely connected with the traditions of ancient Russian icon painting.

The President of the United States was invited to the office of the dean of the monastery and made an entry in the VIP book. In memory of this visit Archimandrite Tikhon made Ronald Reagan a present of a panorama of the Danilov Monastery carved in wood in the monastery's workshop.

Meeting With 'Dissidents' Opens

0005133388 Moscow TASS in English 1251 GMT 30 May 88

[Text] Moscow May 30 TASS—By TASS commentator Sergey Staroselskiy:

Ronald Reagan opened a meeting with a group of so-called "refuseniks" and "dissidents" at his Moscow residence, Spaso House, in the afternoon today.

Significantly, Reagan said when answering a question from reporters ahead of his second session with the Soviet leader this morning that he wanted to meet with "dissidents" "so I'd feel at home".

All indications are that the reception at Spaso House will be dominated by the "problem of human rights" in the Soviet Union.

The human rights issue has been a permanent presence on the agenda of Soviet-American meetings at summit and other levels and it would be naive to pretend that the problem is being overlooked by Moscow, while Washington is telling the Kremlin how to go about resolving it.

This is not so. The Soviet side is seriously concerned about the human rights situation. We are worried, for example, by the discrimination of national minorities, prosecution for political reasons and death sentences passed on minors in the United States.

Moreover, in the USSR we proceed from the indissolubility and interdependence of all the human rights—political, civil, economic, social and cultural. All of them should equally ensure a worthy life for a human being, just as stipulated by the Helsinki Final Act.

In the United States they obviously hold a different view.

Ideological disputes cannot be done away with. But one may not put up with the human rights theme being exploited to foment enmity in state-to-state relations and sabotage the processes of disarmament and detente.

The only possible principle in the humanitarian sphere is not to interfere in the domestic affairs of one another, but to build relations between nations with account taken of the right of each of them to choose its path independently and to discuss all issues on the basis of equality.

Certain steps in this direction have been taken. In particular, the USSR welcomes agreement to form a permanent body on human rights involving deputies of the U.S.S.R. Supreme Soviet and members of U.S. Congress.

Questioned on Dissidents Meeting

0005131788 Moscow World Service in English 1500 GMT 30 May 88

[Text] This afternoon, President Reagan met in his residence with a group of so-called dissidents and refuseniks, people who for various reasons have been denied permission to leave the Soviet Union. The conversation concerned human rights, a topic prominently mentioned during the current visit.

This morning, before the second meeting of the leaders of the two countries, a reporter asked Reagan whether the President recognizes that there have been major changes in the Soviet Union, while he keeps referring to past experience. Yes, President Reagan said, he knew that much had changed in the Soviet Union, and he welcomed this, but still he wished to meet with dissidents. Then, he said, he would feel as if he were at home in the United States.

Mikhail Gorbachev, on his part, said that he had proposed to the President discussing the issue of human rights in greater detail, and for this to set up a seminar as part of parliamentary exchanges. Participants in such a seminar could exchange information and make corresponding assessments.

Meeting With Dissidents Criticized

[illegible]005122488 Moscow TASS in English 1147 GMT 30 May 88

[Text] Moscow May 30 TASS—By TASS commentator Sergey Staroselskiy:

U.S. President Ronald Reagan meets at Spaso House today with a group of so-called refuseniks and dissidents. The discussion will be concerned, of course, with the "problem" of human rights in the Soviet Union.

The subject of human rights has always been on the agenda of Soviet-American summits and other meetings, but it would be naive to say that this problem is hushed up by Moscow, while Washington tells this country how it should be solved.

Nothing of the kind.

The Soviet side is seriously concerned over the human rights situation. In the United States, for instance, what worries us is discrimination against national minorities, persecution of people because of their political views and the passing of death sentences on minors.

Moreover, the USSR proceeds from the premise that all human rights—political, civil, economic, social and cultural—are interrelated and interdependent.

They all should secure worthy life for people, as envisaged in the Helsinki Final Act. In the United States, apparently, there exists a totally different viewpoint.

Ideological disputes are inevitable. But one cannot put up with the fact that the subject of human rights is exploited for purposes of whipping up hostility in interstate relations, for impeding the processes of disarmament and detente.

The only principle that is acceptable in the humanitarian sphere provides for non-interference in one another's internal affairs, formation of relations between states with due account for the right of every one of them to choose on one's own the path and discuss all issues on an equitable basis.

Certain steps in that direction have been made. The Soviet Union has welcomed the agreement on establishing a Standing Body on Human Rights with the participation of deputies of the USSR Supreme Soviet and members of U.S. Congress.

But let's return to the President's meeting at Spaso House.

Soviet Deputy Foreign Minister Vladimir Petrovskiy was asked ahead of the U.S. President's visit to Moscow what he thought about Reagan's plans to meet "refuseniks" and "dissidents."

As a guest of the Soviet Union, Petrovskiy replied, the American President was free to decide with whom of the Soviet citizens it would be interesting and useful for him to meet outside the framework of official functions.

The Soviet official recalled that Mikhail Gorbachev met during his visit to Washington representatives of diverse sections of American society.

"At that time, of course, we were unable to meet all invitations that came from Americans subscribing to different views. There was simply no time for that.

Besides, we wanted the summit to be held normally, so we took into account all nuances," Petrovskiy added.

As to the planned meeting between the U.S. President and the "refuseniks" and "dissidents", he observed, "it is different, for the point at issue is an obviously tendentious selection of participants.

The American action of this kind is hardly aimed at improving understanding between the Soviet Union and the United States."

Pozner Views Meeting

[illegible]005135788 Tokyo NHK General Television Network in Japanese 1200 GMT 30 May 88

[Interview with Radio Moscow political observer Vladimir Pozner by NHK newscaster Jiro Hirano via satellite; date not given—recorded in English with Japanese subtitles; processed from the English]

[Text] [Hirano] The first meeting, which was conducted yesterday, was somewhat focused upon the issue of human rights. Was this also what you had anticipated?

[Pozner] Well, it became clear, especially after President Reagan's speech in Finland, and then this was made more or less official by the American side, that they were putting human rights at the top of the agenda, so there was nothing really surprising, and that was the first issue.

Personally I am not sure if it is the important one, but it was on the agenda anyway. So why not begin with that, although I think that there will be more in-depth discussion on probably the 50-percent cut in strategic offensive nuclear weapons.

[Hirano] I have been looking at the schedule for today, and the interesting thing is that on the second day the Soviets have let the Reagans spend the afternoon as they like, going to the Russian Orthodox church and receiving so-called dissidents or refuseniks. How can you be so tolerant to them?

[Pozner] I believe that Mr Reagan expressed interest in getting a taste of religion in the Soviet Union. And certainly the Danilov Monastery, where he will be going, will give him the opportunity to meet with Russian Orthodox priesthood and to see what is happening in that area. On the other hand, we also know that he wanted to meet with a group of Soviet citizens that are qualified as dissidents or as refuseniks. And again, if the President wants to do that, that is perfectly legitimate.

I personally feel that had General Secretary Gorbachev in Washington met with a group of American homeless or a group of American Indians, or other people in America who have legitimate complaints, the White House probably would not have been very happy with that. I think that the U.S. press, the media, would not treat it kindly, saying that it was not quite in good taste to do this when you are a guest in another country. That is a personal assessment, of course. However, if that is what the President wants to do, he is our guest, and, therefore, he can do what he likes, including visit, of course, a monastery and receiving whom he feels necessary at Spaso House.

[Hirano] Don't you feel that this harms the entire atmosphere of the summit meeting?

[Pozner] No, I don't. I believe that the Soviet leadership is sophisticated enough to understand this, to take it in its stride. They certainly don't applaud it, but I don't think they would allow this to spoil the atmosphere of the summit or the discussions that will be following. The summit itself is far too important as a process to allow something as minor as that to spoil it, to be the wrench to throw into the machinery.

Kremlin Dinner Begins

LD005152588 Moscow TASS in English 1515 GMT 30 May 88

[Text] Moscow May 30 TASS—A dinner on behalf of the General Secretary of the CPSU central Committee Mikhail Gorbachev and Raisa Gorbacheva in honour of the President of the United States Ronald Reagan and Nancy Reagan has just begun in the Kremlin.

Shevardnadze, Shultz Meet; Working Groups Formed

LD005181588 Moscow TASS in English 1800 GMT 29 May 88

[Text] Moscow May 29 TASS—Eduard Shevardnadze, member of the Politburo of the CPSU Central Committee and foreign minister of the USSR, today met with U.S. Secretary of State George Shultz who is accompanying President Ronald Reagan on his official visit to the Soviet Union.

They discussed some issues relating to the agenda of the summit meeting. The ministers set up groups of experts for additional deliberations on military-political, regional, bilateral and humanitarian issues in Soviet-American relations.

The following officials took part in the discussion:

From the Soviet side—Marshal of the Soviet Union Sergey Akhromeyev, first deputy defence minister and chief of the General Staff of the USSR Armed Forces, Aleksandr Bessmertnykh, deputy foreign minister of the USSR, and Yuriy Dubinin, ambassador of the USSR to the United States.

From the American side—Howard Baker, chief of staff to the President, Colin Powell, assistant to the President for national security affairs, Charles Wick, director of the U.S. Information Agency, Rozanne Ridgway, assistant secretary of state, and Jack Matlock, U.S. ambassador to the USSR.

The joint groups of experts began their work today.

Defense Chiefs Yazov, Carlucci Hold Talks

LD005094288 Moscow TASS in English 0934 GMT 30 May 88

[Text] Moscow May 30 TASS—A meeting began here today between the USSR Minister of Defence General of the Army Dmitriy Yazov and the U.S. Secretary of Defense Frank Carlucci. The meeting is being held within the framework of the Soviet-American summit and is already the second between the heads of the military establishments. The first was held in Bern on March 16-17, 1988.

Yazov Comments

LD005102088 Moscow TASS in English 0947 GMT 30 May 88

[Text] Moscow May 30 TASS—General of the Army Dmitriy Yazov, defense minister of the USSR, and U.S. Defense Secretary Frank Carlucci began a meeting here today in the framework of the Soviet-American summit in Moscow.

It is their second meeting. The first one was in Berne on March 16-17, 1988. Opening the meeting in the Soviet Defense Ministry, Yazov said: "General Secretary Mikhail Gorbachev and President Ronald Reagan have given us a good example of how to conduct talks in a spirit of goodwill and mutual understanding.

"I think we shall be negotiating in the same spirit as well." Carlucci readily agreed.

Meeting Described

[3005124288 Moscow TASS in English 1212 GMT 30 May 88]

[Text] Moscow 30 May TASS—A meeting between Army General Dmitriy Yazov, defense minister of the USSR, and Frank Carlucci, U.S. secretary of defense, took place here today within the framework of the Soviet-U.S. summit meeting. This is a second meeting between the heads of defense departments.

The first meeting took place in Berne on March 16-17, 1988. At the time the sides discussed the nature of the military doctrines of the two states, the problems of reducing and limiting armaments. At the same time they did not set the task of substituting for the official talks of the delegations and also for the regular meetings between the Soviet foreign minister and the U.S. secretary of state. Dmitriy Yazov said dialogue of the defense ministers must give one more chance for an in-depth discussion of the military, political and technical issues of bilateral relations and, consequently, promote the strengthening of mutual understanding and trust.

At the talks in Geneva, drafts of a number of documents, relating to an agreement on a 50 percent reduction of strategic offensive arms of the USSR and USA, were formulated. The outlines of the future agreement begin to stand out clearly enough but further movement is being hampered by several key issues that are not resolved.

In particular, the Soviet side proposes to include in the text of the strategic offensive arms agreement a provision, set out in a statement on the results of the summit meeting in Washington of December 10, 1987, which stipulates that the ABM Treaty should be observed in the form as it was signed in 1972.

The question of verification covering long-range sea-launched cruise missiles remains unresolved. The American side, itself not advancing any constructive proposals on verification, only calls in question the feasibility of large-scale verification measures proposed by the USSR. It is obvious that without SLCM limitations, no extensive cuts will be possible in strategic arms because it will leave a potential possibility for circumventing the treaty.

No agreement has been reached either on the question on the procedure for counting long-range air-launched cruise missiles. The Soviet side believes that on heavy bombers the number of missiles they are really capable of carrying should be counted. As for the American side, it proposes to count them on the basis of an arbitrarily chosen figure: for the USA the number of such missiles would be below the real capacities of American bombers. A number of other issues also remain unsettled.

The discussion by the ministers of measures to build mutual understanding and trust in the military field has a great significance. At the Berne meeting the sides reached an understanding on the expediency of holding bilateral consultations to discuss the questions of military activities, outline the principles and create a relevant forum to prevent incidents between the Armed Forces of the USSR and USA.

Further on Meeting

[3005142688 Moscow TASS in English 1414 GMT 30 May 88]

[Text] Moscow May 30 TASS—A meeting was held in the USSR Ministry of Defence today between General of the Army Dmitriy Yazov, alternate member of the Political Bureau of the CPSU Central Committee, minister of defence of the USSR, and Frank Carlucci, U.S. secretary of defense. Sergey Akhromeyev, chief of the General Staff of the USSR Armed Forces, marshal of the Soviet Union, took part in the talk.

They discussed wide-ranging issues in the context of the Soviet-U.S. summit meeting. The defence ministers of the USSR and the United States continued the dialogue launched in Bern in March, 1988. Following the talk that passed in a candid and businesslike atmosphere, the Soviet defence minister gave a dinner in honour of Frank Carlucci. [Moscow PRAVDA in Russian on 31 May in a similar report on page 2 of its Second Edition describes the talks as "frank [otkrovennyy] and businesslike".]

Responding to the question on whether the expectations set for the ministers' meeting were justified, Frank Carlucci said: "Yes, certainly. We had a very positive dialogue. We continued the discussions of the military doctrines that we started in Bern. We had an exchange of views on arms control. We have talked a little bit about military-to-military exchanges between the USSR and the United States and will continue that tomorrow. The tone is all very positive and constructive. And I particularly appreciate the minister's hospitality". [Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian on 31 May carries a similar report on page 3 which renders Frank Carlucci's answer as follows: "Answer: Yes, they have. We had a positive dialogue. We continued our talks on the subject of military doctrines which we began in Bern, exchanged opinions on questions of disarmament, and touched on the subject of military contacts between the armed forces. And all in a positive, constructive spirit. We agreed to continue our talks tomorrow. I express special gratitude to the USSR defense minister for his hospitality."]

Yakovlev Holds Talks With USIA's Wick

[3805193788 Moscow TASS in English 1547 GMT 28 May 88]

[Text] Moscow May 28 TASS—Today Aleksandr Yakovlev, member of the Politburo of the CPSU Central Committe and secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, received Charles Wick, director of the United States Information Agency. He stays in Moscow in connection with the U.S. President's visit to the USSR. During the

meeting the sides discussed a broad range of questions pertaining to Soviet-American cultural exchanges and relations in the sphere of information.

USIA's Wick Interviewed on Relations

[redacted]05082188 Moscow TASS in English 0812 GMT [illegible]y 88

[Text] Moscow May 30 TASS—TASS correspondents Lyudmila Shvedova and Mikhail Svetlichniy report:

"There is no question that there's been a favorable movement since Mr. Gorbachev and his colleagues have come in," USIA (United States Information Agency) Director Charles Wick said when asked about progress in Soviet-American cooperation in humanitarian issues.

"With Mr. Gorbachev's new thinking there have been some very substantial improvements. We've got an arms agreement now, abolishing a whole class of nuclear weapons, the INF. The Soviets have started their withdrawal from Afghanistan, which is one of the principal regional issues. And then both sides are here today, furthering the process of trying to reach a START (Strategic Arms Reduction Talks) agreement", Wick went on to say.

Both sides are working very hard, he noted, to broaden their humanitarian cooperation: "If we really want to subdue tensions and misunderstandings between our two sides on disinformation, etc., let's have our reciprocal people in radio, print, television, magazines, movies sit down across the table and tell each other what we feel is a wrongful, offensive position of the other".

The USIA director said he felt Gorbachev is "sincere" and Soviet leaders seek "to implement his new thinking".

Asked about what he expects from the summit, Wick said that "the mood and the aspirations, of course, are to have the process progress", concluding that "the ceremonies of signing an agreement mark milestones, but the key thing is that the process be energized and get the kind of priority that only the top leaders can get".

Adamishin, Schifter Discuss Human Rights 27 May

[redacted]705183788 Moscow TASS in English 1805 GMT [illegible]ay 88

[Text] Moscow May 27 TASS—Soviet Deputy Foreign Minister Anatoliy Adamishin and U.S. Assistant Secretary for Human Rights and Humanitarian Affairs Richard Schifter held a discussion here today on humanitarian issues.

Humanitarian issues causing concern to the Soviet public were raised with the American side. Attention was drawn to the question of the extradition of the Brazinskas terrorists who killed a Soviet air-hostess, Nadezhda Kurchenko, and found shelter in the United States.

The American side was asked whether it would be possible for the U.S. President to receive Kurchenko's relatives.

The persecution of dissenters in the United States and the position of political prisoners were giving rise to concern.

Schifter answered some of the questions raised.

The head of the Soviet delegation to the Vienna follow-up meeting on security and cooperation in Europe, Yuriy Kashlev, assessed the state of humanitarian affairs at the forum, stressing the possibility of making a breakthrough there and achieving shortly generally recognized agreements that would advance the all-European process.

Schifter, in turn, raised some humanitarian issues that gave rise to concern to the American side.

Yakovlev Receives 'Sane Freeze' Group

[redacted]2905092288 Moscow TASS in English 2100 GMT 28 May 88

[Text] Moscow May 28 TASS—Aleksandr Yakovlev, member of the Political Bureau of the CPSU Central Committee, secretary of the Central Committee, met with a delegation of the Sane Freeze organisation, led by William Coffin, who is currently on a visit in the USSR at the invitation of the Soviet Peace Committee in connection with the Soviet-American summit meeting in Moscow.

On behalf of Mikhail Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, Aleksandr Yakovlev welcomed the members of the delegation, activists of the Sane Freeze organisation, who make a noticeable contribution to mobilizing public opinion for struggle against the nuclear threat and danger of war.

The members of the Sane Freeze delegation expressed support for the USSR's initiatives on ending nuclear testing, on drastic cuts in arms, and declared against the escalation of the weapons race into outer space.

Family of Slain Stewardess Hopes To Meet Reagan

[redacted]905100788 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian GMT 29 May 88

[Text] A report from Udmurtiya: Today the residents of Glazov are seeing off Genrietta Ivanovna Kurchenko and her son, Aleksandr, as they leave for Moscow. They are bringing along an appeal signed by thousands of the town's people addressed to U.S. President Ronald Reagan.

The name of Nadezhda Kurchenko, the courageous flight attendant who died from the bullets of the Brazinskas murders in the autumn of 1970, is known to all. Let us recall that she protected the life of the pilot and passengers of an AN-24 at Sukhumi Airport. Nadezhda Kurchenko's mother, Genrietta Ivanovna, has made many appeals to highly placed people in the White House, asking them to hand over the murders, the Brazinskas father and son, who have settled in the United States, to Soviet justice. For more than 15 years, the requests of the grieving mother and thousands of Soviet people have been ignored. Perhaps this time, when the U.S. President arrives in Moscow, the Kurchenko family will succeed in handing over the appeal to Reagan in person.

Patriarch Prays for 'Success' of Summit

905095688 Moscow TASS in English 0944 GMT [illegible] May 88

[Text] Moscow May 29 TASS—The leader of the Russian Orthodox Church urged believers to pray for the success of the Soviet-U.S. summit in Moscow as the parishes across the land celebrated St. Trinity holiday Sunday.

The message from Patriarch Pimen of Moscow and all Russia to the archbishops, pastors and churchgoers was read out from the ambo [pulpit] during a festive service at the Epiphany Cathedral.

"God's heavenly will has brought us together, people speaking different tongues and coming from different nations, to offer our prayers for the success of the Moscow meeting" between Mikhail Gorbachev and Ronald Reagan, it said.

Patriarch Pimen, describing the summit as an event of exceptional significance, said the eyes of the world are fixed on Moscow as "the future of all humanity and the entire creation of God depends in many ways on the state of Soviet-American relations".

The worshippers in the Epiphany Cathedral included a delegation from the U.S. National Council of Churches of Christ along with representatives of the Christian churches of the Soviet Union.

Noting this fact, Pimen said the group has arrived at the invitation of the Russian Orthodox Church "so as to ask God in a joint prayer for assistance to the meeting of the leaders of the USSR and the U.S.".

"We have a profound belief in the power of prayers and therefore, just like it has been in Geneva and Washington, representatives of our churches will, for the duration of the meeting that is about to begin, be holding a prayer vigil in several Moscow churches," Patriarch Pimen said.

He then voiced the hope for the coming of a blessed time of peace and joint constructive work by peoples for the benefit of all humanity.

The patriarch himself spent the holiday at the Trinity-St. Sergius Lavra (monastery of the first rank) not far from Moscow, in accordance with a long-standing tradition.

The more than 600-year-old monastery on such occasions always attracts numerous pilgrims seeking a patriarchal blessing. They were given it this time as well.

After the service, attended by the Lavra's monks, Patriarch Pimen blessed the believers gathered outside his residence from the balcony of the house.

Church Leaders Send Message to Reagan, Gorbachev

905142288 Moscow TASS in English 1333 GMT [illegible] May 88

[Text] Moscow May 29 TASS—"The Joint Message of USA and USSR Church Leaders to General Secretary of the CPSU Central Committee Mikhail Gorbachev and U.S. President Ronald Reagan on the occasion of their summit meeting in Moscow" is the title of a document handed today by representatives of the churches in the USSR and a delegation of the National Council of the Churches of Christ in the USA, which is staying in Mosow, to Yan Vagris, vice president of the Presidium of the USSR Supreme Soviet. The document will be passed over to Mikhail Gorbachev. As representatives of the press learned, a similar text will be passed to the U.S. embassy.

The message says that the churches in the USSR and USA, as it was in Geneva and Washington, will continue praying to God in Moscow so that the two leaders could do all that lay within their power to preserve the sacred gift of life.

"Here in Moscow we shall be repeating this prayer as you engage in conversations which are being looked upon with expectations by your sisters and brothers in every nation, especially those who suffer now from starvation or terrible wars. Their hunger for peace and their thirst for justice has not diminished, and they look to you once again for signs of hope," runs the message signed by Metropolitan Filaret of Minsk and Belorussia and Dr. Claire Randall, head of the delegation of the National Council of the Churches of Christ in the USA.

"As Christians bound together in the ecumenical movement by a common faith in Jesus Christ, committed to work for the unity of the church and of all humankind, we have repeatedly called on our leaders to lay aside the acrimony and mutual accusations which have so often characterized U.S.-Soviet relations and poisoned the international climate, and instead to engage in negotiations to resolve differences."

"The race to oblivion has gone on for too long," the message runs. "Thank God, you, brother Mikhail, and you, brother Ronald, have shown that it is possible change course. The path to peace is arduous and demanding. We pray that during your days together here you will strengthen your resolve to work in the way of peace."

The message contains an appeal "that by the 2000th anniversary of Christ's coming into the world, God's creation may be delivered from all those weapons which threaten survival, and that all may enjoy the justice, peace and well-being intended by the creator."

Soviet Commentators Criticize U.S. Rights Stance

Reagan Tries To 'Preach'

[redacted]705142388 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1348 GMT 27 May 88

[Text] Helsinki, 27 May (TASS)—U.S. President Ronald Reagan, who is in the Finnish capital en route to Moscow, spoke today in the Finlandia Hall, where the CSCE Final Act was signed 13 years ago. That significant document reflected the political will of states and peoples to improve their mutual relations and render them more active, thus assisting peace on the European continent.

The head of the White House paid the bulk of attention to the issues of compliance of the Helsinki accords, and dwelling also on the agenda of the forthcoming Soviet-U.S. summit talks in Moscow. "In 2 days," he said, "I will meet with General Secretary Gorbachev in Moscow. This is going to be our fourth round of tete-a-tete talks since 1985. The general secretary and I have developed a vast program of Soviet-U.S. relations, which is directly linked to the Helsinki Final Act."

The President stated that in Moscow "the progress made at talks on the whole complex of arms reduction issues will be discussed, and the exchange of views on regional problems will be continued." We, Reagan pointed out, will also discuss various aspects of bilateral relations: in the area of economies, and also scientific and cultural links and exchanges between people, and "will study new paths of cooperation." He expressed the hope that these discussions will bring good results.

A large part of the U.S. President's speech was devoted to human rights, as the present U.S. Administration understands them. Reagan tried to preach to the Soviet Union on how it should conduct matters in this area, giving U.S. recipes to the Soviet leadership and the Soviet people. The head of the White House obviously did not take into account the fact that all 10 principles of the Helsinki Final Act concerning interrelations between states and human rights are included in the USSR Constitution, adopted back in 1977, which serves as convincing evidence of the USSR's recognition of and respect for the founding Helsinki accords.

Bovin on 'Political Tact'

[redacted]705154788 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 29 May 88 Morning Edition p 6

["Political Observer's Opinion" by Aleksandr Bovin: "After the Third, Before the Fourth...."]

[Text] The intensiveness of Soviet-American contacts over the past 3 years has surpassed all expectations. M.S. Gorbachev and R. Reagan have met three times. G. Shultz and E.A. Shevardnadze met 26 (!) times for talks. Last year alone, as a result of various exchanges of people and ideas, some 3,000 "Russians" visited the United States and some 4,000 Americans visited the Soviet Union.

And now Moscow, capital of the "Evil Empire," is expecting the head of the "Good Empire."

Is this a paradox? Yes, and no.

Yes, because in the world of political metaphysics where absolutes rule, and where Good and Evil are invariably spelled with capital letters, the aforementioned "empires" are doomed to an "all-out," eternal holy war.

And no, because in the world of political realism where common sense rules, and where the only absolute is the contraposition of Life and Death, both people and "empires" prefer living together to dying together.

Incidentally, for the 40th U.S. President everything is much simpler. His first premise is: America has become stronger. His second premise is: The "Soviets" respect strength. Conclusion: This is precisely why Moscow has begun to cede its positions and has agreed to meet the United States halfway. Such is the President's logic.

I fully understand that this kind of logic on the one hand comforts R. Reagan himself, and on the other hand allow him to defend himself against those who are bigger Reaganites than himself.

Nonetheless, I will permit myself to put forward another hypothesis. The point, in my opinion, is not that the United States has become stronger. The point is that both Moscow and Washington have become wiser.

Despite many forecasts, including my own, R. Reagan has changed noticeably. He has evidently grasped that cowboy methods of settling relations are good in westerns, but extremely counterproductive and dangerous in big politics. They are not so dangerous for the Hollywood "Indians" but they are extremely dangerous for real-life Americans. Because there is and there can be no force that can deflect a retaliatory strike away from the United States.

The transposition of the USSR's international activities into the system of coordinates defined by the new political thinking has exerted an even more noticeable,

decisive influence on the course of events. We have given up our claim to have a monopoly on the truth. We have stopped viewing the world exclusively through the prism of the East-West confrontation. We have brought universal human values and universal human interests to the forefront of politics. We have resolutely given up ultimatums and the "all or nothing" approach to controversial issues. This has made Soviet foreign policy much more constructive, flexible, and ready to compromise and adopt intermediate, partial solutions as long as they advance us toward a stable, secure world.

Moscow awaits Mr Reagan with a sincere desire to discuss frankly and with a full awareness of the responsility that rests on the two powers a wide range of international problems of every caliber—global, regional, and bilateral. Meetings of this type inevitably have their ritual side. But what we want is less of the ritual beloved of television and more relevant discussion, which is what the peoples of both the USSR and the United States need so much.

The President has a very busy program. He intends to visit the Danilov monastery, meet with refuseniks [otkazniki] and dissidents, visit the Central House of Writers, and make a speech in the Moscow State University assembly hall. We are prepared to give the President every opportunity to know our country better, to meet with a variety of people and hear a variety of views, and to understand, if he so wishes, our difficulties and problems and the meaning of our restructuring.

But there is one discomfiting fact. In R. Reagan's speeches and in commentaries appearing in the U.S. press, one detects an inspector-general flavor. You imagine the President going to the monastery and checking on the freedom of conscience situation there; visiting the Central House of Writers and setting the "Soviets" an examination in creative freedom; embracing the dissidents and issuing recommendations on freedom of speech; meeting with students and giving them a moral lecture on the delights of democracy and glasnost.

Not so long ago the U.S. NEWSDAY magazine wrote that the administration was "torn between" Reagan's essential anticommunism and the political realism toward which the secretary of state is trying to push his chief. Former U.S. Defense Secretary H. Brown assessed the situation a little differently: "...An obviously anti-Soviet President is setting the seal of approval on a form of detente." I can appreciate fully the drama of the situation and I have no intention at all of getting to grips with the President's "essential nature" or trying to influence his attitude. Of course, the President is free not only to think, but also to say what he likes. Even in Moscow. There is no freedom of speech problem here. But there is a problem of political tact.

We are very different. For that very reason we should not try to teach one another lessons. Learning from one another is a different matter. The smoother Soviet-American relations become and the richer their positive content becomes, the better will be the conditions for a mutually enriching comparison of the two ways of life. One would hope that R. Reagan's visit to Moscow will be a new step in that direction.

Kornilov Views Discussions

[illegible]705153988 Moscow TASS in English 1446 GMT [illegible] May 88

["Human Rights—TASS comment"—TASS headline]

[Text] Moscow May 27 TASS—By TASS political news analyst Yuriy Kornilov:

Several American mass organizations, it is reported from New York, are going to send a delegation to Moscow to hand the summiteers their documents on violations of basic human rights in the United States.

Without anticipating the contents of these documents, one has every reason to say that American human rights campaigners wouldn't be found waiting in what to tell the world on the issue. [sentence as received]

The Center for Constitutional Rights, a non-governmental organization in the United States, has released a document listing the names of some 100 political prisoners there.

All in all, however, there are more than 11,000 political prisoners in U.S. jails today, according to an organization of prisoners of conscience.

The vital social rights of Americans are flouted on a mass scale. Suffice it to recall that there are some three million homeless and many thousands of people deprived of the right to work in the richest country in the capitalist camp.

These and other facts cannot but give grave and mounting concern both to the U.S. public and to the public of the other countries that have signed the Helsinki Final Act.

It is only natural that the forthcoming discussion of humanitarian issues in the course of the Moscow-Washington dialogue is keenly awaited by the media and public circles.

In Moscow we are convinced that these problems are really important and pressing. And it is the Soviet Union that has proposed convening an authoritiative international conference to discuss the whole gamut of related issues.

Obviously, such a discussion—whether on a bilateral basis or at a more representative forum—can only be useful and fruitful if it is conducted in a businesslike and serious manner rather than developing into a monologue—a monologue delivered by a side that thinks it

appropriate to pose as a moralist sitting in judgement on the whole world and attempt to lecture others on democracy and judge their record in the field.

It would not be out of place, I believe, to stress this once again today, ahead of the Soviet-U.S. summit.

Speaking on a Worldnet program a few days ago on democracy and human rights, the U.S. President said that "the United States is prepared for useful exchanges" and will discuss these matters "as openly and constructively as possible."

This is an attitude we support. But one cannot fail to note that both some Washington officials and some of the U.S. media outlets have in practice, at least so far, been acting in a different vein.

Gong out of their way to sell the United States as a "bulwark of democracy" and make it appear as good as the only guardian of the Helsinki accords, they have kept up confrontational rhetoric, making all manner of demands on this country and making all manner of terms and claims.

This is an unacceptable, worthless attitude.

Now that the international barometer's needle has finally started to draw away from the "gloomy" mark, it is especially important to make sure that the serious and topical subject of human rights will not be exploited for ends incompatible with better understanding and stronger trust in international relations.

The humanitarian sphere must become an area for cooperation and a businesslike tackling of issues rather than one for confrontation.

U.S. 'Public Organizations' Cited

[redacted]705145288 Moscow TASS in English 1417 GMT [redacted]ay 88

[Text] New York May 27 TASS—TASS Correspondent Yu. Kirilchenko reports:

Representatives of a number of U.S. public organisations on Thursday held a press conference on the problems of human rights. It was timed for the forthcoming Soviet-U.S. summit meeting in Moscow.

"We are gratified that the leaders of the two great powers are prepared to discuss the human rights issue during their meeting, and we consider it our duty to express our point of view on the issue," Karen Parker, a lawyer, said in her introductory speech.

Violations of human rights in the United States have assumed truly mass proportions, it was pointed out at the press conference. The inhuman treatment of political prisoners, the persecution of dissidents, the rampant racism, the tragedy of the starving and homeless are but only some examples which were given by speakers.

It was emphasized at the press conference that the United States did not ratify many important international documents which sealed basic human rights, among them the International Covenent on Civil and Political Rights. The United States is not a party to the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights either.

The American side often tries to present the existence of a host of the destitute in the United States as a purely social issue which has nothing in common with the human rights problem. However, this is wrong from the legal point of view, Karen Parker emphasized, because the international legal documents treat economic, social and cultural rights of the individual on a par with political and civil ones.

William Kunstler, a prominent lawyer, the defence lawyer of American political prisoner Leonard Peltier, stated that the U.S. Government's accusations about alleged violations of human rights in the Soviet Union were absolutely unfounded. Mr Kunstler has just returned after a tour of the USSR where, he said, he did not see any signs of persecutions of dissidents about which there is so much talk in the United States.

The lawyer emphasized that it was worthwhile comparing what he saw with what happens back at home. He described as appalling the U.S. authorities' treatment of those who had been imprisoned for their convinctions.

The participants in the press conference announced that a number of U.S. public organisations intended to send their representatives to Moscow to hand in documents containing information on violations of basic human rights in the United States to the participants in the Soviet-U.S. summit meeting.

Pozner on Rights, Summit

[redacted]705142988 Tokyo NHK General Television [redacted]brk
in Japanese 1200 GMT 27 May 88

[Interview with Radio Moscow political observer Vladimir Pozner by NHK newscaster Jiro Hirano via satellite—live in English with Japanese subtitles; processed from the English]

[Text] [Hirano] Mr Pozner, thank you very much for joining us today. The latest news concerning the coming summit is that the number of meetings has been reduced into four from the originally planned five. What does this mean? Does this mean that there are [as heard] not much to talk about this time?

[Pozner] I don't think that is really the case. They may go back to five afterwards. I wouldn't be too quick to interpret this kind of change meaning that there is not much to talk about. They will be talking about the 50 percent reduction in strategic offensive nuclear weapons. They will be talking definitely about human rights. They will be talking about bilateral relations between the United States and the Soviet Union. And of course, they will be talking about regional conflicts.

[Hirano] OK. Five years ago, President Reagan said that the Soviet Union is an evil empire, a very famous phrase....

[Pozner, interrupting] Indeed.

[Hirano] And now he says that he, Mr Reagan and Secretary General [as heard] Gorbachev, are true friends. What do you think has made this change in his mind?

[Pozner] One of the things that makes human beings different from animals is indeed the ability to change. I also think that President Reagan's image of the Soviet Union, of Soviet leadership, and of a communist, was an image that was created during the height of the cold war period, the McCarthyist period in the United States. So when I think he found the realities to be very different from what he had expected, plus the fact that all of this change was happening in the Soviet Union, I think he, being an honest man, assessed that and expressed that in his recent statement. That's how I understand him.

[Hirano] I see. And if you could look into the mind of Mr Gorbachev—this might be very, very difficult—but has his mind been changed also?

[Pozner] I think it is inevitable that any human being, when he begins meeting with someone else of whom he has had a preconceived notion, or contacting another country about which he has no personal experience, must be affected by the direct influence. And I am sure that Mikhail Gorbachev's view of President Reagan has changed over the four meetings that they will have had, three already now and this the fourth, and certainly going to the United States, seeing Americans on a physical, eye-to-eye basis, I think also has changed his view. I don't see how it could not.

[Hirano] Well, thank you very much, Mr Pozner. I presume that you will be joining us from time to time.

[Pozner] It's been a great pleasure and I hope I have the opportunity to speak to you again.

Korionov Reviews U.S. Record

[redacted]905094588 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian [redacted]May 88 Second Edition p 7

["Viewpoint"by PRAVDA political observer Vitaliy Korionov: "There is Something To Discuss"]

[Text] On the eve of the meeting of the USSR's and the United States' top leaders, the world public is animatedly discussing questions which may become the subject of Soviet-U.S. dialogue. The main concern that disturbs the peoples is security and disarmament, above all, nuclear disarmament. But there is something else: humanitarian problems, for instance.

Speaking a few days ago on the Worldnet television network, the U.S. President said: "In Moscow I will salute the progress which we can see in the Soviets' conduct in the human rights sphere...." And he added: "We will listen when the Soviets criticize us, and as far as possible we will openly and constructively discuss what is causing us concern." Well, this seems to be a business-like approach and it will scarcely meet with serious objections from the Soviet public.

The question of human rights is indeed an important, topical question these days. Let us recall that it is precisely the Soviet Union which is proposing the holding of a conference in Moscow to discuss the whole package of humanitarian problems, including the question of human rights.

It can be said that there are problems with human rights everywhere. Do they really not exist, for example, in the United States? As is known, there are 22 extremely important international documents on human rights. The United States has ratified only six of them. But perhaps, human rights in that country are being implemented in practice, despite this circumstance? No, authoritative U.S. research and public organizations cite figures which testify otherwise.

So, according to figures from a public organization of prisoners of conscience, there are more than 11,000 political prisoners in U.S. prisons, thrown behind bars on the basis of trumped up charges of having committed criminal offenses. Is it necessary to recall the name of Leonard Peltier who is "guilty" because he defended the rights of U.S. Indians? Or John Harris, an activist in the struggle for equal rights for black Americans? And are there not three prisoners in a special women's prison in the State of Kentucky who actively struggled to liberate Puerto Rico from U.S. oppression?

According to figures from U.S. lawyers, there are also up to 200 Americans in U.S. prisons, arrested for taking part in antiwar actions, in particular, in a demonstration at the gates of the Lockheed company which manufactures lethal weapons. Hundreds of people in Nevada were imprisoned for demonstrating against the continuation of nuclear tests by the United States.

Can passing the death sentence on juvenile Americans in certain states be compatible with principles of morality? The European parliament and the organization "Amnesty International" reasonably note that such actions contradict international legal practice and legal traditions in civilized countries.

One can hardly talk about social security for U.S. citizens when, according to an assessment made by the public organization Coalition for the Homeless, up to 3 million people do not have a roof over their heads in this country which is the richest in the capitalist world, and 500,000 of these are children (there were more only in the great depression years). And yet, one of the basic causes of homelessness is that many millions of Americans are deprived of an elementary human right—the right to work.

Some public figures in Washington are fond of blaming the GDR and other socialist countries for the so-called "Berlin Wall," calling it a "scar on Europe's body." But strange to say: They are somehow silent on the real wall erected on the United States' southern border. This refers to metal fences up to 3 meters high (that is higher than the "Berlin Wall") and up to 250 km in total equipped with special night vision apparatus, electronic alarms and vigilantly protected by border subunits. This "wall" blocks the way into the United States for victimized persons from Mexico which the wealthy United States finds undesirable.

It would have been easy to add to the number of such figures and facts. For this reason it is right that the Soviet public is demonstrating a heightened interest in these facts and figures. The Soviet public legitimately asks: Isn't it time for the other side to switch from verbal exercises on human rights to real, practical deeds which place the accent on real concern for the vital needs of millions and millions of people?

Newsmen Briefed on Human Rights

[redacted]905120988 Moscow ARGUMENTY I FAKTY in Russian No 22, 28 May-3 Jun 88 (Signed to Press 26 May 88) p 7

[Unattributed report under general heading "At the Summit Press Center"]

[Text] A news conference on human rights was held at the summit press center on 24 May. The following specific questions were raised:

[Question] In a world divided into different political systems, is it possible to harmonize the different concepts of human rights?

A. Grachev, section chief in the CPSU Central Committee Propaganda Department: We take the prevailing realities into account, and accept the fact that in the immediate future, agreement on the entire package of human rights questions is hardly likely. However, there are fields in which we reach mutual understanding. For example, for a long time now, the Americans have been putting the question this way: In general, what should be considered as human rights? It was further asserted that conditions ensuring a dignified life, including those enshrined in international conventions, were of secondary importance. However, disputes on this question are now losing the features of a "dialogue of the deaf." On one hand, we are listening to the Americans' arguments about the need to guarantee the package of various civil rights, while on the other, the Americans themselves have shown understanding that the right to work, the right to housing, and the right to education must also be examined as part of the overall package of human rights.

[Question] When will the last Soviet political prisoners be set free?

A. Grachev: First of all, we must agree on terminology. You are obviously talking about individuals sentenced under Articles 70 and 190 of the RSFSR Criminal Code. It is known that the number of people serving sentences under these articles has been reduced to 13. Since a review of criminal legislation (a process that is now under way) does not mean its repeal, every specific case must be decided by judicial bodies.

[Question] How do Soviet scientists feel about the absence of the right to strike in the USSR?

I. Kuznetsov, deputy director of the All-Union Soviet Legislation Scientific Research Institute: We do not recognize such a right, but we do not ban it, either. At the same time, legislation in some socialist countries does recognize and enshrine this right. In my opinion, it would be a more correct course for us now to raise by all possible means the role of labor collectives that could influence every sphere of an enterprise's activity. Such a practice would mean that the administration ultimately becomes an executive organ of the labor collective, thus removing any possible conflict situations.

Gerasimov on Rights, Afghanistan

[redacted]905204388 Moscow TASS in English 2019 GMT 29 May 88

[Text] Moscow May 29 TASS—In a dialogue on humanitarian issues, it is necessary to assert a businesslike approach, removing the elements of propaganda and sensationality, Gennadiy Gerasimov, head of the Information Directorate of the USSR Ministry of Foreign Affairs, said today. He took part in a joint Soviet-U.S. briefing here on the results of the first day of the summit meeting between Mikhail Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, and President Ronald Reagan of the United States.

"We know our shortcomings. We are rectifying and will continue to rectify them but the role of pupil, which is sometimes assigned to us across the ocean, does not suit us", Gennadiy Gerasimov said, recalling that the leaders

of the two powers began to discuss human rights issues along with the problems of disarmament, regional conflicts and bilateral relations.

The co-host of the briefing, Marlin Fitzwater, assistant to the U.S. President for press relations, said that during the first meeting between Ronald Reagan and Mikhail Gorbachev, the meeting which continued for one hour and 11 minutes, the President agreed to think over prospects for organizing a regular seminar within the framework of inter-parliamentary contacts, which was suggested by the Soviet leader today.

In answer to a U.S. journalist's question, Mr Fitzwater said that matters concerning bilateral trade-and-economic relations would also be discussed during the summit. He pointed out that the President intended to contribute to creating broader opportunities for the development of trade with the USSR.

Journalists showed a great interest in regional issues. In answer to a question about the Afghanistan situation, Gennadiy Gerasimov said, in particular: "Our serious concern is aroused by the circumstance that the Pakistani side is already beginning to violate the Geneva agreements signed quite recently. Attempts at interfering in the internal affairs of Afghanistan are being made. We hope that an end will be put to all that".

Jews To Demonstrate Outside U.S. Embassy Moscow

[redacted]805134588 Paris AFP in English 1334 GMT [illegible]ay 88

[Text] Moscow, May 28 (AFP)—A group of "refuseniks", Soviet Jews refused permission to emigrate to Israel, on Saturday said they would demonstrate outside the U.S. Embassy here during President Ronald Reagan's visit.

The "Thursday" group, so-called because they have demonstrated outside Moscow's Lenin Library every Thursday since February 18, said they hoped about 50 people would turn up.

They added that they would stage three demonstrations during the summit between Mr. Reagan and Soviet leader Mikhail Gorbachev, which begins Sunday.

The group said the KGB secret police and militiamen had regularly disrupted their demonstrations.

Spokesman Denies Jews Prevented From Leaving

[redacted]905183788 Moscow World Service in English GMT 29 May 88

[Text] A representative of the Soviet Foreign Ministry has denied the Western media claims that the Soviet Union has been detaining the 375,000 Jews who would like to leave the country. Rudolf Kuznetsov said a figure of this kind had never existed. He said the legal documents regulating both entry and exit for families to reunite had been eased and changed, and the duration of considering applications had been reduced. Last year visas to leave the Soviet Union were issued for 40,000 people. It is five times more than a year earlier.

Summit Press Center Officials Discuss Meeting

Broadcasting Official Interviewed

[redacted]805125188 Moscow TASS in English 1126 GMT [illegible]ay 88

[Text] Moscow May 28 TASS—The task of an international electronic press centre organized here by the USSR State Committee for Television and Radio Broadcasting is to promptly inform the world public of the developments at the Soviet-American summit. Over 1,200 journalists from all the major national broadcasting corporations have been accredited there already, Valentin Lazutkin, head of the External Relations Department of the USSR State Committee for Television and Radio Broadcasting, said in a TASS interview.

According to Lazutkin, all that will be broadcast by Soviet television during the summit will be transmitted by Intervision and Eurovision, by numerous broadcasting stations of the world capable of receiving Moscow. For instance, the U.S. Orbita station is planning to organize the relaying of the Vremya (Time) and other Soviet news programs in cooperation with U.S. cable television networks. The USSR state committee will ensure full access to its materials for all the special correspondents from other countries accredited at the Moscow summit. A so-called international program will be specially made for them. It will be a big video reel featuring all the developments on each of the days of the summit that will be easy for journalists to rearrange and comment on.

Ahead of the coming historic event 127 foreign TV groups prepared more materials about the Soviet Union, its people and perestroyka which is under way in the country than they had earlier prepared in a year, Lazutkin said. They made reports about factories, collective farms, cooperatives, Soviet militia, people's courts, research, cultural and public health institutions. USSR Defense Minister Dmitriy Yazov, heads of the General Staff and military specialists of various levels gave detailed and frank interviews to foreign journalists. TV reports were made both at the Defense Ministry, at military facilities, academies and military schools. A trip of a large group of journalists to the Baykonur space-launch complex was organized for the first time.

According to Lazutkin, today, on the eve of the summit, the transmission time used by the international electronic centre is about 5-6 hours a day for each of the television companies represented in Moscow.

Gerasimov on Coverage Plans

[redacted]805135288 Moscow TASS in English 1337 GMT 28 May 88

[Text] Moscow May 28 TASS—5,365 reporters, including 3,300 foreign ones from 62 countries, have been accredited in Moscow to cover the Soviet-U.S. summit meeting, a Soviet Foreign Ministry spokesman said at a briefing at the summit's press centre today.

Gennadiy Gerasimov, head of the Foreign Ministry's Information Directorate, said that of all foreign countries the United States had sent the biggest number of reporters—1,060.

The U.S. was followed by Japan (240 reporters) and Britain (205), he said.

Gerasimov on INF Ratification

[redacted]805142288 Moscow TASS in English 1408 GMT 28 May 88

[Text] Moscow May 28 TASS—Gennadiy Gerasimov, head of the Information Directorate of the USSR Foreign Ministry, described the ratification of the intermediate-range nuclear forces treaty by the USSR Supreme Soviet today as a good prelude for the forthcoming summit meeting. He was speaking at a briefing at the summit press centre today.

He said that dialogue between the heads of the USSR and the USA had already produced important results. "In Moscow one will be able to consolidate the positive achievements: We have managed to reverse the negative development of the international situation, to create a mechanism for discussing with the American side an expanding range of international issues. Changes in bilateral relations were also evident. We would also like these relations to assume a stable character," he said.

Gennadiy Gerasimov drew the attention of journalists to the fact that the USSR continued to regard a search for further agreements in the field of limiting and eliminating arms as crucial for Soviet-U.S. discussions.

"We believe, and there are all indications that the American Administration holds the same view, that the next step must be an agreement on a 50 per cent reduction of strategic offensive arms," he continued. "At the same time, the ABM Treaty must be preserved as it was signed and ratified in 1972."

Gennadiy Gerasimov, speaking of the possibility to conclude the START treaty, noted that verification of compliance with it could be more complicated than that of compliance with the full elimination of a whole class of armaments, for example, INF. "The point at issue is revealing data on armaments which lie at the heart of security of the two countries," he said. Besides, difficulties arise, for example, over cruise missiles, especially those launched from the sea. The Soviet point of view is such here that "if any of these arms is left out of control, for example sea-launched cruise missiles, then all other reductions will be practically meaningless," Gennadiy Gerasimov said.

Gerasimov: 'Positive View' of Treaty

[redacted]005155788 Moscow TASS in English 1541 GMT 30 May 88

[Text] Moscow May 30 TASS—Today's second meeting between Mikhail Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, and President Ronald Reagan of the United States, the meeting in which full delegations also took part, was held in a businesslike atmosphere, stated Gennadiy Gerasimov, head of the Information Directorate of the USSR Ministry of Foreign Affairs.

He spoke here at a briefing at the press centre of the Soviet-U.S. summit.

The talks, he went on to say, centered on disarmament issues, although other matters were raised as well, youth exchanges, for example. The two sides stated the success of the ratification of INF Treaty.

The spokesman for the USSR Ministry of Foreign Affairs went on to say that "the talks were held in a friendly atmosphere, even with an exchange of jokes, but at the same time in a businesslike atmosphere, with the two sides discussing specific matters. Highly serious problems were discussed. Specifically, the two sides considered obstacles which should be overcome in preparation of a treaty to halve the strategic offensive arms of our two countries. The Soviet side expressed readiness to prepare and sign the treaty with the present administration. It seemed to us that the present administration took a positive view of such readiness of the Soviet side."

Moscow-Washington Radio Link Set for 2 Jun

[redacted]800210200 Moscow TASS in English 2013 GMT 28 May 88

[Text] Moscow May 28 TASS—The Moscow-Washington radio link-up to be held at 23:00 of Moscow time next Thursday, June 2, will be devoted to the outcome of the Soviet-American summit meeting. An agreement to this effect has been reached between the USSR Gosteleradio [State Committee for Television and Radio Broadcasting] and the American corporation National Public Radio.

As a TASS correspondent was told by a spokesman for Gosteleradio, the dialogue will be held with the participation of experts on bilateral relations, who can be asked a question on the phone by any listener on both sides of the link-up. Thus, in particular, Professor Radomir Bogdanov and Professor Sergey Plekhanov of the Institute of the USA and Canada of the USSR Academy of Sciences

have agreed to participate in the link-up from the Soviet side. They can be asked questions during the link-up by the following phone numbers 233 69 19, 233 62 75 and 233 66 07.

In the USSR the link-up will be broadcast live on one of the all-union programmes. In the USA, on top of the 300 radio broadcasting stations of the National Public Radio, the link-up programme will be available to 3,500 commercial stations for broadcasting through satellite communication channels.

PRAVDA's Vasilyev Previews Summit

2705210188 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 26 May 88 First Edition p 4

[Article by PRAVDA Political Observer Gennadiy Vasilyev: "The Times and 'Summits'; the Soviet-American Summit Begins Tomorrow in Moscow"]

[Text] The pace of the age of missiles, electronics, and space is quickening, and is compressing time. If at one time, the distance between important international conferences that went down in the history books was measured in decades or even centuries, it is now frequently limited to mere months.

It seems like only yesterday that we were returning from Washington after the Soviet-American summit. We were flying home excited at having been party to a historic event that took place before our very eyes. One can hardly believe that more than half a year has passed since then. And now here we are in May 1988; tomorrow is the start of the visit to our country by the American President, R. Reagan, which will be the fourth Soviet-American summit in the last 2 and 1/2 years.

Direct dialogue between the top leaders of the two great powers always contains a great potential for influencing international affairs. The very fact of this dialogue, not to mention its content, exerts a tremendous effect on mankind's overall perception of the world. Therefore, it is no surprise that the eyes of the world are fixed on Moscow. Press and television commentaries, statements by prominent politicians, assessments, guesses, predictions.... People want to know what can be expected from the new summit meeting, and how it will influence the general course of events. The text of M.S. Gorbachev's answers to questions from THE WASHINGTON POST and NEWSWEEK are being read with close interest.

When speaking of the agenda of the Soviet-American summit, four groups of issues are normally singled out—arms limitation and disarmament, bilateral relations, regional problems, and questions of a humanitarian nature. The order in which they are listed depends on the preferences of the speaker. In my view, it is difficult to dispute the fact that the logic of our times has placed questions of disarmament in the foreground. After all, this is precisely the way in which we are tackling the major task of our age—halting mankind's slide toward the nuclear abyss and saving life on our planet.

Back then, in December 1987, when we were returning to Moscow from Washington, we had a weighty and encouraging load in our hands—persistent efforts in the spirit of the new political thinking had culminated in the signing of the Treaty on the Elimination of Intermediate- and Shorter-Range Missiles. The first agreement in history on scrapping two classes of nuclear arms! Just a few years earlier, few could have thought that something like this would have come about under the current U.S. Administration, and that this treaty with us would be signed by Reagan—a politician who had carned a firm reputation as an anticommunist.

However, a recognition of reality, which was aided to a tremendous extent by changes of mood in the world, helped the President to take that important step that American historians will undoubtedly consider a plus on his record. There was also the accord between the leaders of the USSR and United States to "instruct their representatives at the Geneva talks to strive to complete the drafting of a treaty on the reduction and limitation of strategic offensive arms and all the documents linked with it within as short a time as possible so that, preferably, it may be signed during the next meeting of the states' leaders in the first half of 1988."

We can state confidently that both these issues will occupy a special place in the work of the Moscow summit. The first—I mean the INF Treaty—in the form of the official completion of the important business, in the form of the exchange of the instruments of ratification by the two leaders. (Provided of course, that there is no emergency development in the Senate). The second—the preparation of a package of accords on strategic offensive arms and antiballistic missile defense—on the plane of intensive study [prorabotka] so as to emerge at as high a degree of preparation for this agreement as possible.

Alas, it has proved impossible to fulfill the mandate of the previous summit by completing the drafting of the treaty on strategic offensive arms in time for the Moscow meeting. But there is nothing fateful about that. Given goodwill and the determination to seek mutually acceptable solutions to disputed issues, such an accord might be prepared in the foreseeable future. That, in any case, is what the Soviet side believes. In this sense, the Moscow summit is not the final goal of the progression, but an important stage en route to the new treaty.

I believe that an in-depth exchange of opinions will be conducted in Moscow on the whole spectrum of problems of world politics and also on various aspects of relations between the USSR and the United States. If the

path, defined at the meetings in Geneva, Reykjavik, and Washington, is continued, an additional impetus will be given to the processes of the ongoing development of Soviet-American relations.

Our rapidly moving century makes us impatient. One wants politicians to find solutions to complex international problems and to climb as quickly as possible to new and higher plateaus of peaceful cooperation between peoples. This impatience is justifiable. The continued development [razrabotka] of even more sophisticated types of weapons of mass destruction and the spread of the arms race to new spheres and regions gives no pause for breath.

But let us be realistic. On the way to a safer world there are many obstacles—differences in views, philosophies, and ideologies, and mutual mistrust which has become entrenched and which is constantly making itself felt. Is this not why the U.S. defense secretary, when addressing naval cadets in Annapolis, suddenly speaks about the Soviet Union as the "main enemy," even though the President is already en route to Moscow?

Forces that have really latched onto the arms race and derive economic and political sustenance from it also continue to function. These are the members of the military-industrial complex, the apologists for the confrontational "position of strength" policy. They give constant reminders of themselves as if to show how difficult it is to follow the path to the demilitarization of politics, thinking, and international relations in general. In recent days, the most belligerent of them waged a desperate battle in the Senate against the Soviet-American INF Treaty, which has already been signed and which enjoys the support of the majority of Americans. They were trying, if not to frustrate its ratification, to at least hamper it prior to the Moscow meeting. The "hawks" from the lower chamber of the U.S. Congress did not fail to make their presence felt too. An hour after Reagan's departure from the United States, they promulgated a new report from one of the subcommittees of the House Armed Services Committee. According to their document, a treaty on serious reductions of strategic offensive arms "could prove dangerous, insofar as the USSR might either violate it or, on a legal basis, exceed the limits contained in it." What is this? A peculiar sort of farewell for the President before discussing the question of a 50-percent reduction in strategic offensive arms at the meeting?

The opponents of a peaceful future for mankind are not limited to those who, like Senator Helms or the congressmen from the subcommittee, operate openly. Many dangers lurk in the actions of those who with one hand vote for the INF Treaty, and with the other, for the modernization of the remaining nuclear arms, the stockpiling of cruise missiles, and the creation of new "exotic" types of weapons of mass destruction. It is impossible not to see that such actions can devalue what has been achieved and undermine the hopes of the peoples.

If one takes into account all the obstacles which have been created over the decades on the path to a secure world, it must be said that in the past period of between 2 and 1/2 and 3 years, great progress has been made in Soviet-American relations and, consequently, in the overall improvement of the international climate.

A top-level meeting is called a "summit" in English. If one views this definition as an image, one can say that the path from the very beginning, and then from one summit to another, has not been easy. It begins from the cold chasm in which Soviet-American relations found themselves. Political wisdom, self-possession, and flexibility were needed in order to avoid giving way to emotion and sinking into negativism, and instead to work for the sake of the future.

In Geneva in November 1985, the foundations of this historic dialogue were laid and the principles for the two countries' conduct in the international arena were defined. In Reykjavik in October 1986, an intellectual breakthrough was accomplished in Soviet-American relations, which opened up the apparently fantastic prospect of a nuclear-free world. In Washington in December 1987, the first major step was taken in this direction—the INF Treaty was signed.

And so Moscow, May 1988, the latest Soviet-American summit. The peoples expect it to make a major contribution to the development of a constructive dialogue between the two countries and in the preparation of decisions that will make our world a safer place, more tranquil, flourishing, and worthy of man and his intellect.

When such events in world politics take place, the attention of the press, especially the Western press, focuses on the personalities of the participants in the dialogue. This is what the Americans like to call "the chemistry of human relations." One need hardly dispute this approach. The ability of leaders of such different countries to find a "common language" helps the solution of political issues and its absence makes it more difficult to do so.

Nevertheless, insofar as both countries recognize the need to build up a dialogue and improve relations, it is clear that this is more than just a question of the personal positions of the leaders. It is an imperative of our times. And it points to the necessity for a continuation of the Soviet-American dialogue, and for continuity and soundness to be imparted to our relations. After all, it is a question of the vitally important interests of our countries, and of the peoples of the entire world.

Petrovskiy, Akhromeyev Presummit Briefing

[redacted]05113788 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian [redacted]ay 88 Second Edition p 7

[TASS report: "Time for Constructive Solutions"]

[Text] The Soviet approach to the main topics to be discussed during the upcoming Moscow summit between

the leaders of the USSR and the United States was the subject of a detailed conversation held at the Soviet-U.S. summit press center on 26 May.

The agreement reached on intermediate- and shorter-range missiles and the Afghan settlement are vivid examples of a renewal of international policy. They attest to the fact that dynamic dialogue between the USSR and the United States can and must be an important source of postive changes in our mutually dependent world, V.F. Petrovskiy, USSR deputy foreign minister, stressed at the opening of the news conference.

In his opinion, the meeting between M.S. Gorbachev and R. Reagan not only makes it possible to sum up definite results of cooperation between the two states over the last few years, but also allows Soviet-U.S. relations to move forward and the main areas for further efforts in building a more secure world to be outlined.

The Moscow meeting will open up real opportunities for reaching a new level of dialogue and mutual understanding and for seeking areas of agreement on all aspects of the agenda pertaining to Soviet-U.S. relations. This includes arms limitation and reduction, regional problems, humanitarian questions, and bilateral contacts.

Touching on arms reduction issues, the USSR deputy foreign minister noted that a treaty to halve Soviet and U.S. strategic offensive arms and an agreement on nonwithdrawal from the ABM Treaty will be key points at the Moscow talks. The fact that it has not proved possible to prepare such a treaty for signing at the Moscow meeting should not cause any surprise, much less any disappointment, he said. The future treaty on strategic offensive arms will concern the most fundamental aspects of Soviet and U.S. security; therefore, it should be elaborated in the most thorough manner from the standpoint of balancing the interests of the two sides, and the smallest details must be checked out.

At the same time, the USSR Foreign Ministry spokesman stated that the fact that virtually no one now doubts the feasibility of the goal of 50-percent strategic offensive arms cuts is a portentous and encouraging phenomenon of world politics.

Dwelling on Soviet-U.S. relations, V.F. Petrovskiy noted that over the last 3 years positive trends have emerged in this area. At the same time, he admitted that the potential for bilateral cooperation—primarily trade and economic cooperation—is still by no means being fully implemented. The task is to create the conditions under which it can fully blossom.

The course of the news conference demonstrated the enormous interest being expressed in the forthcoming Moscow event. Many questions were asked about the prospects for completing the preparation of a treaty on strategic offensive arms.

In the 18 months since the meeting in Washington, a considerable amount has been done with regard to preparing a treaty on strategic offensive arms cuts, Marshal of the Soviet Union S.F. Akhromeyev, USSR first deputy defense minister and chief of the USSR Armed Forces General Staff, noted. The USSR and the United States have worked out a definite formula that makes it possible to ascertain the relationship between the ABM Treaty and strategic offensive weapons. The two sides have come a considerable way together in solving the problem of defining subceilings for both ground- and sea-launched ballistic missile warheads. There has been progress toward solving the problem of mobile ICBM's. Washington only saw the reaching of agreement in principle, whereas now we are close to reaching agreement on more specific questions of launcher and warhead numbers. There has also been progress with regard to the question of air-launched cruise missiles.

However, as the marshal put it, there are still many substantive disagreements. This concerns sea-launched cruise missiles [SLCM] in particular. As far as I am aware, he said, the U.S. side will bring definite proposals on these issues to Moscow. It would be good if the Moscow meeting managed to prepare a document in the form of directives from the leaders of the two states to the delegations at the Geneva talks.

Responding to a question from a West German correspondent, S.F. Akhromeyev asserted that he disagreed with the opinion of the U.S. military that SLCM's are unverifiable. Agreement on verification can be reached if there is agreement on the classes of submarine and surface ship on which the deployment of SLCM's would be permitted. But, the Soviet military leader noted, the whole point is that U.S. Navy representatives disagree with this. The U.S. side needs to agree that the entire triad and all strategic systems must be identically subject to verification, and then we will arrive at a successful result more quickly.

The chief of the General Staff noted the progress made toward a nuclear test ban. The joint Soviet-U.S. experiment on verifying such tests on sites in the Semipalatinsk region and in Nevada is evidence that we have come quite a long way in this area. If after the experiment we are convinced that this verification is useful, then next in line will be the ratification of the 1974 Treaty on the Limitation of Underground Nuclear Weapon Tests and the 1976 Treaty on Underground Nuclear Explosions for Peaceful Purposes.

Indeed, V.F. Petrovskiy agreed, prospects are now emerging for arrival at the ratification of these treaties. However, he stressed, ratification is not an end in itself for the Soviet Union, but merely an interim step. Immediately after ratification, we deem it necessary to proceed to the limitation of the yield and of the quantity of nuclear explosions for a year in order then to move toward the general and complete prohibition of nuclear

weapons tests. It is precisely in this way that the Soviet Union understands the content of the work of the delegations in the framework of the full-scale talks in Geneva.

Touching on the talks on the prohibition of chemical weapons, S.F. Akhromeyev expressed regret with regard to the fact that movement forward in this sphere has slowed down. He considers the basic obstacle to be the problem of monitoring [kontrol] the enterprises producing chemical weapons. The Soviet side advocates that all enterprises (state and private) including those belonging to international corporations, should be subject to monitoring [kontrol]. So far the United States has not agreed to this.

In V.F. Petrovskiy's opinion, the development of events recently indicates the relevance of taking urgent measures to prevent the proliferation and use of chemical weapons. At the same time, the main goal should not be obscured—the banning of chemical weapons and the elimination of the industrial base for their production.

A British journalist asked S.F. Akhromeyev why the Soviet Union does not withdraw its troops from Central Europe unilaterally. "But why should we do that unilaterally?" the marshal asked in reply. As is well known, in Central Europe there is an approximate parity of armed forces and armaments; therefore, such a question is simply irrelevant. There is asymmetry. There are types of armaments which the Warsaw Pact has in greater number. In certain types of armaments, NATO has superiority. We have agreed to exchange data on these types of asymmetry and subsequently to eliminate them and begin the bilateral reduction of armaments and armed forces to any figure which NATO proposes.

The chief of the General Staff indicated the possibility of successfully completing consultations between the Warsaw Pact and NATO on the elaboration of a mandate for the future talks on a reduction of armed forces and armaments in Europe.

Commenting on the U.S. defense secretary's speech in Annapolis, the marshal of the Soviet Union stated that he fundamentally disagreed with the assessment of F. Carlucci, who claimed that the configuration of the Soviet Armed Forces is offensive in character. The facts give a different answer to this question: The Soviet Union is surrounded by U.S. military bases from Alaska to northern Norway. Thousands of aircraft and around 500,000 U.S. military servicemen are based there. America's forward-based nuclear facilities are deployed here, too. The Soviet Union has nothing of that kind, S.F. Akhromeyev emphasized.

Considerable attention was paid at the news conference to questions concerning the settlement of regional conflicts.

The Soviet Union believes that an international consensus is currently taking shape not only with regard to the Near East settlement but also to the convening of an international conference on this issue, V.F. Petrovskiy said. The USSR has noted certain positive elements in comments by G. Shultz, particularly with regard to the attitude toward the convening of such a conference. We believe, the USSR Foreign Ministry representative stressed, that the time has come to put the settlement mechanism into operation.

It is very important now, he added in reply to a question from an Israeli correspondent, to agree that the convening of this conference should cease to be a slogan and instead become a real deed. It is necessary to move on to organizational measures.

In V.F. Petrovskiy's opinion, the experience of the Afghan settlement showed that the diplomatic process connected with the solution of conflict and crisis situations is difficult and protracted. But where there is the will and desire to find a common balance of interests, this process yields results. It is now very important to support the efforts undertaken by the UN general secretary to step up the attempts being made to settle the Iran-Iraq conflict and fulfill Security Council Resolution 598.

The question of the size of the limited contingent of Soviet troops in Afghanistan was raised. In this regard the chief of the USSR Armed Forces General Staff reported that Soviet troops in the Republic of Afghanistan on 15 May totaled 100,300 men.

"What connection is there between the USSR's domestic and foreign policy?" asked a correspondent from the CHICAGO TRIBUNE. Responding to this, N.V. Shishlin, a senior official of the CPSU Central Committee, stressed that there is an organic link between restructuring within the country and the first steps, which are also evident, in the restructuring of Soviet-U.S. relations. However, one should not exaggerate the depth and scale of what has been achieved. Positive changes in the international situation are linked not only with Soviet reality but also with the changes in the world outlook taking place in other countries, changes which reflect present-day reality.

Returning to the original theme of the discussion, a NEWSWEEK correspondent asked whether the Soviet approach to the holding of summit meetings has changed.

We are not devotees of dialogue for its own sake and are seeking to ensure that the talks are productive, G.A. Arbatov, director of the USSR Academy of Sciences Institute of the United States and Canada, stated. Experience shows that each summit so far has generated processes which improve the international situation. We also expect this from the Moscow meeting.

What will happen next in Soviet-U.S. relations? Replying to that question, the academician stressed that in the past 3 and 1/2 years their character has changed for the better, so much so that opportunities have appeared for demilitarizing Soviet-U.S. relations and tearing down the entire edifice of the cold war and its infrastructure. Such a course of events meets everyone's interests—the Soviet Union, the Americans, and the rest of the world.

General Chervov Comments on Summit Talks

'Military Aspects' of Relations

[redacted]805212188 Moscow World Service in English [redacted] GMT 28 May 88

["Talk" by Colonel General Nikolay Chervov; date and place not given—recorded in Russian with superimposed English translation]

[Text] [Announcer] The Soviet Union expects arms control issues to figure prominently at the summit talks. Without belittling other issues, we feel nuclear arms issues are of vital importance for the destiny of this world. Colonel General Nikolay Chervov, a frequent spokesman on military matters, talks on the military aspects of U.S.-Soviet relations.

[Chervov] The Soviet Union is firmly committed to a policy of improving Soviet-American relations. That policy determines the military aspects of our country's approach to improving relations with the United States. The dialogue between the leaders of the two countries has made possible military contacts between the Soviet Union and the United States for the first time in the postwar period. The meeting of Defense Minister Dmitriy Yazov and Defense Secretary Frank Carlucci opened the dialogue in this sphere. They discussed the military doctrines of the two countries and ways of preventing incidents involving their respective armed forces and restoring military contacts suspended during the years of the cold war. Naturally they did not reach understanding on all issues, but they did agree on some issues. The visit of the chief of the Soviet Army General Staff Marshal Akhromeyev to Washington and his meeting with the chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff Admiral Crowe were of great importance for promoting dialogue. The main objectives of these contacts is to rule out the possibility of hostilities between the Soviet Union and the United States.

We need predictability and stability in the balance of military strengths between our two countries, and the American notions of nuclear deterrence, surgical strikes, selective use of nuclear weapons and low-intensity crises do not contribute to it at all. We believe that these notions are misconceived, they rely on military strength, and their realization may result in gross blunders. It is impossible to improve contacts unless we improve procedures of notification about the movements of the armed forces of the two countries not only within the framework of the conference for European security and cooperation and with respect to ground forces, but also with respect to the activities of the naval and air forces.

We'd also like the United States and NATO to realize that when we say that we don't want war, we attach a very profound meaning to that statement. In this nuclear age, war is fraught with a holocaust. The 27th congress of the Soviet Communist Party decided to create an added economic potential in this country by the year 2000, roughly equal to what has been created over the 70 years of Soviet government; and these peaceful plans are the best evidence that we need peace and peace alone. Our defense potential does not exceed the limits of sufficiency guaranteeing that no one will disrupt our life and peace. The Soviet Union will never launch aggression, and awareness of this must remove obstacles in the way of reducing military confrontation.

Taking into account that the world now is a closely knit and indivisible place, I believe that in the long run the Soviet Union and the United States will need each other more, and this goes for the military area as well. [end recording]

Discusses Summit Prospects

[redacted]705214288 East Berlin Domestic Service [redacted]erman 2010 GMT 27 May 88

[Interview with Defense Ministry official Colonel General Nikolay Chervov by correspondent Klaus Juergen Fischer in Moscow; date not given—recorded; Chervov speaks in Russian with superimposed German translation]

[Text] [Fischer] Comrade Colonel General, you have been involved in the Soviet-U.S. negotiations on arms limitation for years. What do you, as an expert on disarmament, expect of the Moscow summit?

[Chervov] I am sure that the Moscow meeting will contribute to a further improvement in Soviet-U.S. relations and in the overall international situation. I believe that the disarmament negotiations will receive a further boost and—this is the most important point in my opinion—the level already reached in the disarmament negotiations will be officially fixed. That will make international relations more stable.

[Fischer] You were a member of the Soviet delegation at all three previous summits. It now seems likely that at the fourth summit here in Moscow, a treaty that you have also been working on, the treaty on medium- and shorter-range missiles, will come into force. How is the Soviet Union prepared for the realization of this treaty?

[Chervov] The realization of the medium-range missile treaty calls for a great deal of strenuous preliminary work, which is being conducted in two directions—preparations for the destruction of the weapons covered

by the treaty, and preparations for the inspections provided for by the treaty. All the places where missiles will be destroyed in the Soviet Union have already been determined and prepared. Work has already been concluded at the destruction sites, so I can say that everything has been prepared in such a way that the first missile can be detonated almost immediately after the expiration of the 30-day period stipulated by the treaty, once the document has come into force. The preparations for the inspection trips will also be completed soon. The Soviet Union is ready to meet the obligation it assumed on entering into the INF Treaty.

[Fischer] Even if the treaty on a 50-percent reduction in strategic offensive weapons cannot yet be signed, considerable progress has nevertheless been made. What progress has been made in which areas and what obstacles remain?

[Chervov] If today one were to assess the work done on the treaty to reduce strategic offensive weapons by half, it must be said that a great deal has already been done. The joint drafts of the treaty and the relevant documents are already in hand; in other words, the protocol on inspections, the protocol on changing and destroying the weapons, and the memorandum on the agreement. However, there are still many brackets in these documents, which indicate questions that have yet to be agreed. But the texts have been drafted and will be on the table at the summit. All it takes is a political decision to open up the brackets and complete the treaty. Both sides have been making progress on a number of questions of principle. These include mobile intercontinental missiles and the upper limits for ballistic missiles. An approximation was also achieved in calculating longer-range airborne cruise missiles. There is quite a bit of common ground in the positions of the two sides on the issue of verification [kontrollfragen]. However, there are also some unresolved matters of principle, for instance, longer-range sea-based cruise missiles, adherence to the ABM Treaty as it was signed in 1972, and nonwithdrawal from the treaty within an agreed period. Unless these questions of principle are resolved, a reduction of strategic offensive weapons will be impossible. Here, as I have said, a political decision is required. I hope the greatest measure of progress will be made on these points at the summit.

[Fischer] What documents will be ready for signing by 1 June?

[Chervov] It may be possible to sign an agreement on conducting a joint experiment to monitor [kontrollc] nuclear tests, and a new protocol on the 1976 treaty on nuclear explosions for peaceful purposes. No new agreements are foreseen in any other disarmament sectors. However, that should not disappoint us. Progress has been made in every field of disarmament. Therefore, it is extremely important that the state of negotiations achieved by the two sides be fixed in a joint statement at the Moscow summit. That will be of great significance.

Academician Velikhov on Hopes for Summit

[redacted]805212988 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1700 GMT 28 May 88

[From the "Vremya" newscast; address by Academician Yevgeniy Velikhov, vice president of the USSR Academy of Sciences—live or recorded]

[Text] Dear comrades! It is with justified hope that we await the start of the fourth summit in Moscow. This meeting is the continuation of a process which began in Geneva, reached its dramatic incandescence in Reykjavik, where the foundations of the movement toward a nuclear-free world were laid, and then moved to Washington and finally on to Moscow. Moscow is not only a symbol of the continuation of this process of dialogue; it is also experiencing its first fruits. What is moved by this process? What allows one to hope that this process may be irreversible? First and foremost, we are people, people of the planet as a whole. Never since the Cuban crisis has an anti-nuclear movement grown up and developed so strongly, a movement of people who have become aware of the threat to civilization, the threat to all life on Earth. However paradoxical it may seem, when the current U.S. Administration first came to power, when it openly announced its plans for militarization, for conducting a possible nuclear war, for expanding its nuclear arsenal—it was these very plans which woke people up. They clearly perceived the threat posed by such plans in all its horror, all its irrationality. This harnessed a powerful force and a powerful foundation for the movement. The movement encompassed all continents, all political spectrums, parties, and various professions.

What fruits can we see today? Well, first and foremost, of course, after 15 years of stagnation we are witnessing the first ratification of an important treaty on eliminating intermediate- and shorter-range missiles. We are seeing good progress at negotiations toward a 50-percent cut, and we hope that in the near future, within the term of this administration, it will be possible to conclude this treaty as well. We can see a certain degree of progress toward a treaty on restricting—and I hope at some stage on totally banning—nuclear tests. One would, of course, like there to be greater progress in this regard, for all the bases for such a treaty exist.

We can see a certain degree of progress in other aspects of our bilateral relations, as well as in regional spheres—there is the Geneva accord on Afghanistan, as you know. And, finally, we can see progress to a certain degree in our scientific and technical cooperation. We have begun designing a thermonuclear reactor: Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev held talks on this issue in Paris with President Mitterrand and in Geneva with President Reagan. Now we have really started to design the first thermonuclear reactor. A whole series of agreements have been concluded. We thus await the current meeting with the hope and conviction that it will be a further step on the long and difficult but inevitable road to a nuclear-free world.

'Top Priority' Program Focuses on Summit

[redacted]05233088 *Moscow World Service in English* [redacted]GMT 28 May

["Top Priority" program, presented by Vladimir Pozner, with Dr Radomir Bogdanov and Dr (Igor Moloshchenko) of the United States of America and Canada Institute of the USSR Academy of Sciences]

[Text] [Pozner] How do you do, ladies and gentlemen. This is Vladimir Pozner presenting "Top Priority." With me on the panel, Dr Radomir Bogdanov, who's here most of the time, almost a permanent member one might say, and (Igor Moloshchenko), also a doctor who works for the USA and Canada Studies Institute and who's in sitting for Sergey Plekhanov, as he has done in the past. Welcome to both of you.

We are now on the eve of the summit, and my first question to you is what do you think of the shift in President Reagan's last speech where he said, or hinted very strongly, that the main object on his agenda would be human rights?

[Bogdanov] Vladimir, would you like me to be quite honest, frank with you and with our listeners, or would you like me to be diplomatic because you put it like that, that we are on the eve? (?As) we are on the eve, you have to follow some rules, but still...

[Pozner, interrupting] No, no, no, I would like you to speak in a spirit of glasnost, openly, candidly, and honestly.

[Bogdanov] Okay. If you want me to speak in the spirit of glasnost, that's my aim, too. Let me say this: I'm not surprised, I'm not surprised by what you call a shift. It's not a shift; it's something like that nearer the visit is, the more the President is trying to secure himself from whom? [sentence as heard] From his own people, from the right. And I'm sorry for the President, I'm sorry to say that because he doesn't make an impression of very self-assured man, if he has to talk so much about this very important (?thing), human rights. Let me say something about that later on. But this shift you know, makes very bad impression. I'm sorry to say that. It looks like, you know, the President all the time has to say: I am yours, I am with you, please trust me, I'm not going to betray you.

[Pozner] So what you're saying is that the President is trying to appease the more conservative right-wing elements?

[Bogdanov] To appease, exactly, yes, more conservative right-wing elements, to not only appease them but, I'm sorry to say, to please them. And if you keep in mind what is going on in the American Senate where he has to (?face) the opposition, I'm sorry to say that opposition, which has nothing to do with the substance of the treaty, I'm sorry to say, which has to do with sometimes even with the personal relations with this President. And when he has his own believers, the (?famous force) saying something unpleasant, very unpleasant about their own President, maybe he has to defend himself. Number two, let me say something, and I, we don't care about human rights—I mean not that we don't care, I mean that we are ready to talk. That problem does not exist for us.

[Pozner] You mean the problem of discussing it?

[Bogdanov] The problem of discussion of human rights. People are ready for discussion, not only for discussion but for solutions of the problem. We admit we have problems, but let me say something even more important to my American listeners. The problem of human rights, for, as it looks for them, is something foreign for us. But in this country there is a very major process which is called democratization, and democratization within our country. What is it? One of the (?parts of it is) our own human rights—yours, his, mine; that's what we are caring now about. Even the President comes to the Soviet Union and he cares about human rights [words indistinct] and we can count them on our fingers. That makes me a little bit, you know, uneasy because, well, I'm caring about my own human rights, this is the problem. Do you see my point?

[Pozner] Dr (Moloshchenko)? I see your point of view. What do you feel?

[(Moloshchenko)] Yeah, I will simply add that, you know, I don't have any major disagreement with Prof Bogdanov's statement.

[Bogdanov] Why, why?

[Pozner] (?Please, please).

[(Moloshchenko)] But I think that there is a very simple rule that the less business you can expect during the summit, the more rhetoric you can have. Now we know that the treaty for the strategic missiles reduction isn't ready, so we can expect a lot of rhetoric. But frankly, I would use this opportunity—I mean this willingness of President Reagan to discuss first of all, human rights issues, so to say—in order to educate him about the processes which take part in the Soviet Union. And so in this sense, I hope that it will be a dialogue, not just an exchange of rhetoric, but a real dialogue. Okay. He has this perspective; we know his perspective of human rights which has a different perspective and it's not just rhetoric now, but a real political process in our country. And I don't think that President Reagan is very much aware of the very many different aspects of this process. So I think it's a good opportunity to talk to him about it.

[Bogdanov] Maybe you're right. We should not worry Vladimir about that, let him come and let...let's say something about it to the American President.

[Pozner] Well, you know that he is going to receive, or at least there are rumors to that effect, that he will receive a group of dissidents and refuseniks and people like that who will certainly give him one side of the story only. Will he have the opportunity to see the other side at all? What do you think?

[Bogdanov] Look, Vladimir, it sounds, I'm sorry, it sounds silly. Now in the Soviet Union to talk about human rights, talking about only three, four people, why he doesn't meet the whole Soviet people (?then)?

[Pozner] Yes, that's a good point.

[Bogdanov] Why he doesn't, why he doesn't ask me? I'm also caring about my human rights, but without American interference. We do deal with that ourselves, and we don't need American help in that because we deal with our own government, with our own party, and they are—in the party and the government—they are also aware of all the problems of human rights we have in this country. And it does concern all of us, not only (?five or) four people or the groups you have mentioned.

[(Moloshchenko)] Well, let me just put this problem in a little bit different perspective. We have a lot of problems in our society; but look, for many decades our society didn't mention, so to say, a number of problems. Let me mention, for example, environmental problems. For many decades we were just talking that everything is fine, we have very strict rules and our environment is clean and safe and so on. And now, suddenly, we've found that we have enormous problems in this respect as well. But, you know, it is for the society to decide what is number one priority. And the problem is that usually our American counterparts, they talk about the problems which are not regarded as a priority by the Soviet people, or at least as a number one priority. You know, I would agree immediately that the problem of emigration, for example, is a very important problem for the Soviet Union when a lot of Soviet people and (?telemedia) will talk about it. Well, okay, of course, you know there is some lack of glasnost in this respect; and I think that this problem should be discussed more openly and so on and so on. But still, the last words should be said by the society, and it didn't say it. You know, we're talking now about touching to different problems, about our environment, health care, housing, food supplies, things like that.

[Pozner] Don't you find it somewhat presumptuous on the part of any government leader to go to another country and to, as it were, preach on this type of subject. I mean, I can see many areas in the United States where there is a serious deficiency of what I consider to be human rights. I have not heard of a Soviet leader taking that as one of the main points of his agenda when talking to an American leader. Why is this consistently done on the other side? I find it difficult to...

[Bogdanov, interrupting] My answer is very simple. If you are people given by God, chosen by God, picked up by God, if you are a city shining on the hill, if you are this and that [words indistinct].

[Pozner] So you have a right to do it.

[Bogdanov] Of course, Vladimir, I have a right to teach you what you should be like and how you should behave. Isn't it?

[Pozner] Well, I see your point, to be sure.

[(Moloshchenko)] Well, I think simply that the history of our two countries and the peoples are very different because, okay, we lived for centuries in a very complex environment. We have a lot of neighbors you know, on the east and on the west with very different values and they understand, their understanding of human rights or whatever. So it was just a must for us to be tolerant and to accept the values of different societies. But it wasn't, I think, that American society didn't have this kind of experience. They simply didn't have this need, this necessity...

[Pozner, interrupting] Well, I don't know. I have to say that when I look back a week ago when we had these shows that I hosted about the United States and there was an audience of ethnic minority Americans talking about their problems—black Americans, Chicanos, and so on—what they were talking about, in my opinion, was a limitation on the most elementary human rights. And they were there talking about these things, and yes, they could talk about them—as a matter of fact, Dr Martin Luther King was killed for these rights—but they're still in the same situation. As a matter of fact, today they're worse off than they were 20 years ago. And that's considered to be perfectly okay in the sense of, oh yes, people will say: Well, yes, we have the problem, but nobody's getting excited or worked up or angry about them, and yet...

[Bogdanov, interrupting] That makes me to believe, Vladimir, that there is not too much seriousness in all that. If you are really serious, if you are not making a cheap propaganda, I'm sorry, if you are not making a cheap propaganda show, then you should be serious about that. Let me, let me put it that way, if you take today Soviet newspapers, any newspaper, and read about the abuses of human rights happening in this country and how they are being defended now, and if you look at somebody that has been refused to go out, I'm sorry to [words indistinct] I (?get) children's, you know, children's games something like that, something like that.

[(Moloshchenko)] Well, you know, I don't quite agree because, for us, a tolerant attitude towards the different opinions about human rights it was a, it was a necessity. It was a political imperative because we couldn't survive in this environment, you know, different cultures, different people, different societies and states. You know, we

would have much more wars and invasions and quarrels with our neighbors whatever with this kind of attitude. We should be tolerant, but I think that Americans they didn't feel this pressure. Okay. Vladimir, you're talking about minorities, but they simply could disregard their problems and go ahead without any major [words indistinct].

[Pozner] That's true, that's true.

[(Moloshchenko)] For us it would be catastrophic, you know, we would have a war with our neighbors...

[Bogdanov, interrupting] Because we are, because we are very different, because we are very different by nature...

[(Moloshchenko)] Not by nature, by history, by...

[Bogdanov, interrupting] ...by history, by nature, [words indistinct]...

[(Moloshchenko), interrrupting] By facts of geography and so forth.

[Bogdanov] Because, before we close down, let me put one question to our host, this is very rarely the case. Vladimir, for heaven's sake explain to us why you are so much worried about this shift. What happened to you? This is the main point of our "Top Priority."

[Pozner] Well, no, we can move on to another subject. It's simply that I was intrigued by the fact that in Helsinki, President Reagan found it necessary to bring up this particular aspect of what he will be talking about in the Soviet Union. And now to move onto something else. I've heard some journalists, Western journalists, say that since there will not be any major agreement signed, does that not mean that the summit is a failure even before it's started? How do you feel?

[Bogdanov] I feel that this summit is doomed to success.

[Pozner] Doomed to success? All right.

[Bogdanov] Yes, and I mean it, I emphasize it. Because this is already a part of the mechanism of the Soviet-American relations and we should think not in terms of this administration, we should now think in terms of future, further administrations. They, what they have done great, I mean two leaders? They have built up this mechanism. Maybe this summit, the, the great importance of this summit in that there will be putting finishing touches to that mechanism, even without some great papers being signed in Moscow. That's what, what's important, for I don't know, what we...

[(Moloshchenko), interrupting] Well, that's correct, but you are talking as an analyst, as a professor, you know, I don't think...

[Bogdanov, interrupting] Yes, I happen, I happen to be the professor of history, by the way, by the way.

[(Moloshchenko)] Yes, I remember it very well, but, you know, it is very difficult for (?media) people to (?take) this position. There should be some, you know, genetic coverage of any event, but specifically of the summit.

[Pozner] But don't you think that has to do with the fact there have been very few summits, very few top-level meetings between the leadership of the Soviet Union and the United States. I mean, the last time we had an American President here in Moscow was 14 years ago. Now, let's imagine a situation where the President of the United States meets with the prime minister of Great Britain. They meet, they talk and that's all, and nobody says it's a failure; it's a normal procedure.

[Bogdanov] This is very good point, Vladimir.

[Pozner] Now what I'm saying is why shouldn't the leaders of these two countries that are so important for the fate of the world, the relationship of which can really either make peace or total destruction, why shouldn't they meet on an annual, if not even a biannual basis, just to talk about (?current problems) without...

[Bogdanov, interrupting] I believe you guys, journalists, you are guilty for that.

[Pozner] We are guilty?

[Bogdanov] You are guilty.

[Pozner] Why are we guilty?

[Bogdanov] Because you are [words indistinct]. Because, number one and number two, you've, by your profession, which I respect very much, you are always looking for something sensational, hot. That's why, I'm sorry.

[Pozner] All right.

[(Moloshchenko)] Probably there is one more reason, by the way, for this emphasis on human rights, er, it's Helsinki and it is the place where Helsinki Accords were signed.

[Pozner] 1975, yes.

[(Moloshchenko)] Yes, and for many people...

[Bogdanov, interrrupting] (?You try) to justify American (?visit there).

[(Moloshchenko)] I'm trying to explain it; it's not the same thing as to justify anything. But for many people in the States, you know, Helsinki Accord is first of all the third basket, the human rights basket. Well, we should mention, of course [words indistinct] that there are some other baskets and so forth, but it is a fact that...

[Pozner, interrupting] Well, we should be happy...

[(Moloshchenko), interrupting] ...Political life and the weather. You remember about...

[Pozner, interrupting] We should be happy then that President Reagan was not in British Parliament, because, if you remember, from 1983 he spoke about the evil empire. Well, you might have to do something like that. But seriously speaking, you said something interesting, Dr Bogdanov. You said that you felt this summit was doomed to success because it was part of a mechanism that had been set in motion by the two leaders. I take it you're alluding to an ongoing process which would do what I've been speaking about and that is make these meetings a regular thing where not necessarily you must have some mind-boggling agreement.

[Bogdanov] This is something like we are meeting with you every week.

[Pozner] That's a nice comparison, I thank you very much.

[Bogdanov] Why not, why not?

[Pozner] We only have a few seconds left.

[(Moloshchenko)] Who is the President and who is the general secretary? I don't understand.

[Pozner] We can talk about that when we're off the air, if that's all right with you. At any rate, I think that we can both say, all of us can say, that we look forward to the summit with a sense of optimism and excitement, and that we will join you a week from today with probably what will be a wrap-up of what happened during the summit, and our analysis of why it was indeed doomed to be successful. On that note, I invite you to join us a week from today at this time.

PRAVDA Notes Soviet Expectations of Summit

[redacted]805153988 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 27 May 88 First Edition p 1

[Unattributed report: "For the Visit to the Soviet Union by U.S. President Ronald Wilson Reagan"]

[Excerpts] The President of the United States of America, Ronald Wilson Reagan, arrives in Moscow today on an official visit. [passage omitted]

R. Reagan has held talks with M.S. Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, on three occasions—in Geneva (1985), Reykjavik (1986), and Washington (1987).

At the Washington meeting, the leaders of the USSR and the United States signed the historic Treaty Between the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics and the United States of America on the Elimination of Their Intermediate- and Shorter-Range Missiles.

The Soviet people expect the new Soviet-U.S. summit to be an important contribution to the further improvement of relations between the USSR and the United States. They also expect it to promote the general improvement of the international situation, and the strengthening of peace and the peoples' security.

Prospects for Future Relations 'Optimistic'

[redacted]005144988 Moscow SOVETSKAYA KULTURA in Russian 28 May 88 p 5

[Political observer Grigoriy Oganov article: "USSR-United States: The Main Topic of the Epoch"]

[Excerpt] [Passage omitted] And so, the U.S. President will set foot in the Soviet Union, in its capital, Moscow, on 29 May 1988. He will leave behind 14 years of abstention from what is, generally speaking and looked at without prejudice, a natural step for the leader of a power which is prepared, without waiving its own national interests, to respect the interests of its partner and of other members of the community of nations.

The Soviet people welcome the President, his wife, and the other U.S. figures. They wish them fruitful and productive talks and a pleasant and useful stay in our country.

We have no desire to see the United States as an adversary, or every American as a personification of "the enemy image." Apart from everything else, apart from considerations of rationality and common sense, this is not an element of our tradition. This is something that has been confirmed on many occasions throughout the history of our relations like, for example, during World War II when we were allies in the struggle against the most evil enemy of mankind. We are, therefore, in an optimistic and businesslike mood. As a matter of fact, much was said on this topic during M.S. Gorbachev's recent meeting with U.S. journalists. It was emphasized then that the Soviet-U.S. dialogue established on a regular basis is the most important feature of Soviet-U.S. relations at the present stage. This dialogue has already made it possible to achieve a great deal, including history's first treaty on the elimination of certain types of nuclear weapons. But the prospects which are emerging are even more important and more inspiring.

We know, of course, that such a development of affairs does not suit everyone. The report by the so-called North Atlantic Assembly, entitled "NATO in the 1990's" and published a few days ago, literally 1 week before the Moscow summit, speaks bluntly of the concern felt by right-wing circles in the United States and West Europe about the incipient positive changes in the international

arena. The report proclaimed that "nuclear weapons will continue to play a key role in NATO's doctrine of deterrence." It recommends that the governments of NATO countries place emphasis on long-range nuclear systems in the future and that they watch vigilantly lest the USSR gain a "double advantage" (?!) for itself at the talks. Given such views, it is, of course, difficult to talk about "new thinking" among influential Western politicians.

Ultimately, however, a decisive role regarding the fate of peace will be played by our restructuring and our readiness to persistently pursue our peace-loving foreign policy course. Today people in the West speak with alarmed amazement and uncertain hope of "Russia suddenly turning from an adversary into a friend." And this seriously worries the West. But there is always the reservation: "What if a sudden change in the situation occurs in the Soviet Union," what if conservative figures gain the upper hand?

I think that our partners are quite sincere in voicing these fears.

Such is the present situation. Such is the close intertwining of problems of domestic and foreign policy. Such is their reciprocal influence. We must take all these complexities into account, for the contemporary world is complex and contradictory.

But we firmly believe that a peaceful future can be secured for the world, and we are doing everything possible to this end.

TASS Assesses Significance of Summit

[redacted]05063988 Moscow TASS in English 0632 GMT [redacted]ay 88

[Text] Moscow May 29 TASS—At last this day has come. Today, on May 29 U.S. President Ronald Wilson Reagan is beginning his official visit to the Soviet Union.

The 40th President of the United States is arriving in Moscow for the first time after 14 years of interval in the official visits to the Soviet Union of the American heads of state.

Just like all the previous meetings in Geneva, Reykjavik and Washington, the Moscow summit is in the focus of world attention. This is not simply a meeting of leaders of two countries. The biographies of a son of a shoe dealer from Illinois and a son of a peasant from the Stavropol Region represent, from each of the sides, the essence of the two opposite ways of life. This is going to be a meeting of two fundamentally different social systems with their own values, ideals and priorities. The relations between them determine, to a large extent, the fate of the whole planet. And the world is realizing the increased responsibility of the Soviet Union and the United States in resolving the vital issue for mankind: To be or not to be.

The course of events is raising the hope that the world will not be doomed to fatal confrontation. What's going on is an unswerving, though not so rapid as it is wanted to be, advancement along the path being cleared by the new political thinking.

That is why the Moscow summit to be held in the late May of 1988, a nice period of the Russian summer, is hoped to become another landmark leading mankind away from mistrust and confrontation and bringing it closer to mutual understanding, cooperation, and a fair and nuclear-free world.

Correspondent Discusses Reagan's 'Changed' Views

[redacted]05050488 Moscow TASS in English 0410 GMT [redacted]ay 88

["Moscow Summit and New Realities"—TASS headline]

[Text] Moscow May 29 TASS—By TASS diplomatic correspondent Vadim Biryukov:

U.S. President Ronald Reagan arrives in Moscow today for the fourth Soviet-American summit meeting.

Just three years ago, there was hardly anyone who could imagine that the 40th American president, known for his anticommunist views and power approaches to the solution of problems on the international scene, would be the high representative of the United States that would sign a Soviet-U.S. intermediate-range nuclear forces (INF) treaty and, moreover, bring to the Soviet capital the first document on nuclear arms reduction in history, ratified by the U.S. Senate.

Besides, Reagan and his team have carried out, in the course of the Soviet-U.S. dialogue, certain work to prepare a draft treaty on strategic offensive armaments and take a number of conflict situations in relations between our countries out of deadlock.

Does it mean that the American leader has changed his views?

Perhaps, it would be more correct to describe this turnaround as a result of understanding the fact that the world has changed and that the interests of our countries are changing. And the President has probably taken a fresh look at the existing realities without giving up his known views.

In any case, when asked by Soviet television what was more important in the present-day world—the power of muscles or the power of reason, Reagan answered, "the power of reason", and called for showing "our mutual desire for a peaceful world by eliminating some of the msot horrendous of the weapons, such as the nuclear weapons".

Paying tribute to the American side's contribution to the process of normalising the international situation, one cannot but note that the Moscow summit could be more fruitful.

It would be just to say that the United States could have passed a bigger part of its half of the way toward the conclusion of the INF Treaty.

Since the Washington summit, the U.S. has not shown any progress on the problem of compliance with the ABM Treaty, nor displayed a constructive stand at talks on limiting sea-based cruise missiles, and is holding a groundless position on air-based cruise missiles.

The Soviet Union pins its most serious hopes on the Moscow summit. It proceeds from the idea that the very continuation of the Soviet-American dialogue at summit level is important and essential, as the Soviet and U.S. leaders will centre their attention during their further contacts on paramount issues of the present-day world.

There will appear a possibility to reach a new level of dialogue and mutual understanding, which will make it possible to enhance the level of mutual security in future.

All nations of the world will gain from this.

Arbatov Discusses Reagan's 'Harsh Tone', Summit

[redacted]905205088 Moscow Television Service in Russian 0905 GMT 29 May 88

[From the "Vremya" newscast; studio interview with Georgiy Arbatov, director of United States of America and Canada Institute of the Academy of Sciences, by International Journalist Eduard Sorokin on 29 May—recorded]

[Text] [Sorokin] Georgiy Arkadyevich, in your opinion what will be the main questions discussed at the Moscow summit meeting?

[Arbatov] By the logic of things, of course, the main problem ought to be the problem of disarmament, and that is natural, in particular the progress toward a treaty on a 50-percent reduction in nuclear weapons, on banning nuclear tests, on a chemical weapons ban, on how, after all, we should approach the opening of negotiations on reducing conventional armaments and armed forces in Europe, and so on. But I have the impression that the Americans are a bit hard up in this regard, and in one interview after another President Reagan repeats this kind of favorite saying of his, that states do not trust one another. But it is precisely armaments that have always been a source of distrust, and those who armed themselves very strongly normally armed themselves in order to attack their neighbor. This is particularly true now, in the nuclear era.

The second range of problems is regional problems. Previously Reagan and the Americans paid a great deal of attention to these: They were always counterposing them to disarmament problems, trying to say: no, no, no, this is the most important thing. That's how things were at the previous summit meetings. And I understand why there was one awkward problem for us there: It was the presence of our military contingent in Afghanistan. Now as soon as the withdrawal of our troops from Afghanistan begins they immediately lose interest in that problem. At any rate, that's the impression I got, although the problem is becoming increasingly criticial. And, most importantly, opportunities are opening up to achieve something in the Middle East, Central America, and southern Africa. The situation there is indeed very dangerous. But here too I do not see any great interest.

There is still a third range of problems. As a matter of fact, Ms Ridgway, deputy secretary of state, said yesterday that at this Moscow meeting human rights problems will be the main ones. But I think that they are going to be disappointed here. We are doing a great lot now. It is the central, one of the central directions of restructuring, democratization of the country, and the solution of all these questions. And a very extensive, very serious solution at that. And so we do have things to say, and we have things to say not only about ourselves. There is nothing that we have to try and justify. We have things to say also about economic rights, political rights, and political prisoners in the United States. We also have things to say about human rights in other countries, including those countries which the United States could influence easily. These are its friends and allies such as Chile, South Korea, Israel, Paraguay, where absolutely monstrous violations of human rights are taking place.

[Sorokin] Indeed. According to "Vremya" reports, prior to the meeting in Moscow President Reagan has spoken quite often, more often than, let's say, before the other meetings. What comment would you make about these speeches?

[Arbatov] Well, you know, I would call them, all in all, propaganda, of course. I did not notice in them any serious political presentation of issues. It was what they call in the United states public relations [preceding two words in English]. And in many instances, of course, it was unconvincing propaganda to say, for example, that in the Soviet Constitution it is written that the Government grants the rights, whereas the U.S. one begins: We, the people. At the time when "We, the people" was written, 10 percent of the electorate [as heard] in the United States had the right to vote. And even Reagan himself won his greatest electoral victory with 27 percent of the electorate's votes, you know.

There are also other things there. Indeed, our women stand in lines. Indeed, we have problems, whereas in the United States they do not have them. They have no

homeless, no unemployed. In the United States for more than 10 years they have not been able to adopt the 27th amendment to the Constitution, which proclaims equal rights for women.

[Sorokin] All right, so how would you explain the harsh tone of President Reagan's pronouncements, especially on the eve of a summit meeting?

[Arbatov] Well, you know, there are various versions here. One of these has been suggested to me by a certain arch-reactionary journalist, Rowland Evans, to the effect that allegedly it was almost a conscious attempt to give something to the opponents of restructuring and democratization. I do not want to suspect the President of that. It is more likely that that is what Rowland Evans wants, and he is good at lies.

[Sorokin] Fine, but from all this reasoning I get the impression that the Moscow meeting is not going to be as successful as the previous ones. Or is that not so?

[Arbatov] Well, I hope that it is not so, and I even think that it is not so. I think that processes have been set in motion already so that the normalization of relations is going to continue. Common sense has been augmented by harsh economic and political necessity for the United States, for us, and for the whole world. So history is going to develop according to its logic, and I hope and believe that the Moscow meeting will be another step in the process under way, which in merely 2 and 1/2 years has, after all, led to such changes both in Soviet-U.S relations and in the situation in the world which, quite frankly, 3 years ago I would have found hard to believe possible.

[Sorokin] So we are going to stay optimists?

[Arbatov] Yes, cautious optimists, taking a sober view of things.

[Sorokin] Fine, thank you very much.

Zorin Stresses Importance of 'Dialogue'

[redacted]905201588 Moscow Television Service in Russian [redacted] GMT 29 May 88

[From the "Vremya" newscast; videotalk by political observer Valentin Zorin]

[Text] It must be said that certain bourgeois media are attempting to play down the importance of the Moscow summit meeting. It is, in particular, being said that during this meeting important treaties will not be signed. It was found impossible to prepare a treaty on the 50-percent reduction of strategic offensive arms, since the Geneva talks on this issue are proceeding with much difficulty. It is said that the previous meeting in Washington produced the INF Treaty, whereas agreements of the same caliber will not be signed in Moscow.

Those who avail themselves of this kind of logic judge things in a very shallow way, it seems to me. If one has to draw parallels between recent Soviet-U.S. summit meetings, why not recall Reykjavik? No treaties were signed there either, nor any agreements concluded, but it is precisely Reykjavik that constituted an important political breakthrough, having laid the foundation for the following accords.

Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev recently stressed that the whole importance of specific accords reached during the past Soviet-U.S. summit meetings, including the signing of the INF Treaty, is the holding of a regular Soviet-U.S. dialogue—that constitutes the most important political achievement.

It is precisely this dialogue that was continued in Moscow today, a dialogue whose results cannot be assessed with the aid of simple arithmetic. The results of the Moscow meeting will be measured not by the quantity of the documents signed but by the degree of moving along in the direction of solving the cardinal problems of the present time. We will be able to judge these results in a few days.

Army Daily Traces Summit Process, Prospects

[redacted]905144788 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA [redacted]ssian 28 May 88 Second Edition p 5

[Article by Captain First Rank V. Kuzar: "Much Work Lies Ahead; Our Special Correspondent Writes on the Moscow Meeting"]

[Text] Just now, when preparing to cover the visit to Moscow by U.S. President R. Reagan, one unconsciously recalls the meeting in Washington between the two leaders. The entire diversity of color of that historic event, which I had occasion to witness as KRASNAYA ZVEZDA's correspondent, comes to life once again in my memory.... On 5 December, there was a mass rally in Lafayette Park in support of the signing of the INF Treaty. Its participants then set off for the Soviet Embassy and, linking hands, formed a human chain symbolizing the close link between the USSR and the United States.... By the Marriott Hotel, which housed the international press center, a group of young people kept a constant vigil. On one occasion they hung up a placard which said: "If Larouche is elected president, he will break the treaty immediately." There was no need for questions—those were neo-fascists. On the green lawn in front of the White House, invited guests and journalists assembled for M.S. Gorbachev's official send-off. While waiting for the ceremony, an animated exchange of opinions took place on the signing of the treaty on intermediate- and shorter-range missiles, and the other results of the meeting. Someone—evidently a connoisseur of natural signs—observed that the weather had been good before and during M.S. Gorbachev's visit to Washington, but that rain was now falling. Rain at parting is good, for it portends a new meeting soon....

And so here we are on the threshold of a new meeting. Tomorrow, in the St. George's Hall of the Moscow Kremlin, the official welcoming ceremony for President Reagan will take place. His visit will begin, as will his talks with M.S. Gorbachev, which are designed to become yet another milestone in the Soviet-American dialogue.

We may state plainly that in historical terms, the time that has passed between the Washington and Moscow meetings is negligible. However, it has proved suffificent to feel in full measure the effect of the positive trends in international relations. There is a growing realization in the world that a peaceful future for mankind can be guaranteed not by nuclear deterrence, but by a balance of reason and goodwill, and by the creation of an all-embracing system of international security. Under the effect of the new political thinking, a switch is taking place from confrontation to peaceful coexistence, while the winds of "cold war" are being replaced by those of hope and trust.

At this point, how can one fail to recall that the third meeting between the leaders of the two great powers became a unique catalyst for events of truly global import? One of those events was the Geneva agreements on Afghanistan, which rank in significance with the Treaty on the Elimination of Soviet and American Intermediate- and Shorter-Range Missiles. The Geneva agreements not only create conditions for Afghanistan to be an independent, neutral, and nonaligned state, but also point the way toward a peaceful solution to all regional conflicts. They confirm yet again the truth that there are no deadlocked situations, only impasses of political thought and will. They can be avoided if one is guided in actions not by the concepts of violence, but by recognition of the fact that each people has the right to choose its own path and that whether we survive or perish—we can only do so together.

This is now so obvious that it seems everyone must understand it. Nevertheless, those connected with the "war party" [te kto otnositsya k "partii voyny"] are entirely reluctant to recognize this. They are opposed to any accords with the Soviet Union, and they are putting up stubborn resistance to the disarmament process. That could be seen in Washington during the signing of the INF Treaty, and it has been manifested plainly in attempts to delay the ratification process. Here one cannot fail to mention the provocation by U.S. warships in the Black Sea, which was deliberately organized to introduce tension into relations between the USSR and the United States. With hackneyed references to "the Soviet threat," the strong-arm politicans are trying to push through their plans to modernize nuclear weapons in Western Europe and "compensate" for the two classes of nuclear missiles subject to destruction. It is only to be regretted that for the sake of immediate benefits, representatives of the U.S. Administration sometimes allow themselves to be led along by adherents of a hard line and allow public statements in the cold war spirit.

On this subject, a perfectly reasonable question arises: What should one expect from the new summit? If one heeds the voice of the world public, the answer is clear. The peoples expect, as public opinion polls show, the consolidation of the positive changes in relations between the countries, the reduction of strategic offensive arms, and the prevention of the deployment of nuclear weapons in space. The problem of the elimination of tension and conflict in the world's hotspots also requires urgent solution. Other matters, too, are assigned a place that is by no means the least important—both humanitarian issues and the development of direct links between the USSR and the United States in various fields—trade, economic, and cultural links and scientific contacts between people.

It is precisely all these problems that constitute the agenda of the Moscow summit. As always, when commenting on the topics of the talks, the Western press offers its correspondents great latitude for making predictions. And is there anything that does not figure here! "Gorbachev will propose to Reagan that yet another meeting be held—in Vienna or Budapest...." "Reagan must be prepared for Gorbachev to announce the unilateral withdrawal of 50,000-100,000 Soviet troops from central Europe...." "Reagan will take a proposal on sea-launched cruise missiles" to Moscow, and so on. Let us neither confirm nor deny these statements. However, we should point out one thing: The Soviet Union has always approached dialogue at summit level with the greatest sense of responsibility, and requires the same of its partner. If this is displayed, one can count on new highs in Soviet-American relations and the struggle for mankind's survival and development.

Moscow is ready to greet the guest from the United States. For several days now, the USSR Foreign Ministry Press Center has been working energetically in accordance with the program of the Soviet-American summit press center. A press center has begun operating at the International Trade Center, where a hall seating 1,200 has been placed at the disposal of journalists. The Rossiya Hotel has also been transformed for the duration of the summit. Parabolic antennas for space communications have been installed by the entrance and the interior resembles a large radio and television complex. There are 50 ministudios in there. So all the conditions have been created for the journalists' work and no more and no less than 5,000 of them are expected from almost 100 countries.

Naturally, the program of R. Reagan's visit to Moscow is of interest to everyone. Much of the working time in the visit will be devoted to conversations with M.S. Gorbachev, talks with the entire delegations attending and those confined to a narrow circle of participants. Moreover, as seems very likely, there will be a meeting with representatives of the Soviet creative intelligentsia at the Central House of Litterateurs, a visit to the Danilov Monastery and a conversation with representatives of

the Russian Orthodox Church, an address to the teaching staff and students of the Moscow State University, and a visit to the Bolshoy Theater. The U.S. President is also planning to meet with so-called "refuseniks," about which KRASNAYA ZVEZDA has already written. There will most likely be other functions, too.

Going back to the meeting between the two leaders in Washington, I remember that during the official send-off ceremony at the White House, M.S. Gorbachev said: "As before, much work lies ahead." This work must be done both during the Moscow meeting and after. So we wish it success.

'Negative' Pre-Summit Media Coverage Noted

[illegible]2905134988 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian [illegible]May 88 First Edition p 5

[Own correspondent V. Linnik dispatch: "Growing Interest"]

[Text] New York, 28 May—As the day and hour of the Moscow summit approaches, the U.S. mass media carry a growing wave of reports on very diverse aspects of life in our country.

Newspapers, television, and radio are discussing at length the CPSU Central Committee Theses for the 19th all-union party conference, which were published yesterday. Considerable interest was generated here also by the results of a public opinion poll conducted in the USSR and the United States by the All-Union Institute for Sociological Research at the request of THE NEW YORK TIMES and CBS. Although "due credit" must be given to U.S. journalistic ethics—CBS-TV anchorman D. Rather immediately raised doubts about the objectivity of the poll.

By no means all the U.S. coverage of our life on the eve of the Moscow summit meeting is favorable. All sorts of hints have been dropped about work being done to spruce up some Moscow rayons for the U.S. visitor's arrival. There were references to—readers have probably already guessed this—"Potemkin villages." As if it had never occurred to their authors that a host who respects his visitor would tidy up his home for the visit.

Some U.S. mass media also picked up the topic of the U.S. President's speech in Helsinki yesterday, in which he expressed hope for "expansion of rights and freedoms" in the Soviet Union. As if by command, local television screens started showing shots of believers in the USSR, "protest" demonstrations, drunkards spotted by a cameraman in Moscow's streets, and so on.

Meanwhile a delegation of U.S. civil right activists headed by legal expert Karen Parker is on its way to Moscow. The delegation, representing a number of U.S. public organizations fighting for the rights of prisoners of conscience and U.S. ethnic minorities, is bringing to our capital a list of U.S. political prisoners. The list, which contains more than 100 names, is to be handed over to M.S. Gorbachev and R. Reagan during the Moscow summit meeting.

As a matter of fact, I do not wish to reduce U.S. coverage on the eve of the summit only to the "negative." No, much is being shown and said about the expanded contacts between our countries in all spheres, run after arrival

Biryukov Analyzes Reagan's 'Turnaround'

[illegible]05110788 Moscow TASS in English 1044 GMT 29 May 88

[Text] Moscow May 29 TASS—By TASS diplomatic correspondent Vadim Biryukov:

U.S. President Ronald Reagan arrived in Moscow today for the fourth Soviet-American summit meeting.

Just three years ago, there was hardly anyone who could imagine that the 40th American President, known for his anticommunist views and power approaches to the solution of problems on the international scene, would be the high representative of the United States that would sign a Soviet-U.S. Intermediate-Range Nuclear Forces (INF) Treaty and, moreover, bring to the Soviet capital the first document on nuclear arms reduction in history, ratified by the U.S. Senate.

Besides, Reagan and his team have carried out, in the course of the Soviet-U.S. dialogue, certain work to prepare a draft treaty on strategic offensive armaments and take a number of conflict situations in relations between our countries out of deadlock.

Does it mean that the American leader has changed his views?

Perhaps, it would be more correct to describe this turnaround as a result of understanding the fact that the world has changed and that the interests of our countries are changing. And the President has probably taken a fresh look at the existing realities without giving up his known views.

In any case, when asked by Soviet television what was more important in the present-day world—the power of muscles or the power of reason, Reagan answered, "the power of reason", and called for showing "our mutual desire for a peaceful world by eliminating some of the most horrendous of the weapons, such as the nuclear weapons".

Paying tribute to the American side's contribution to the process of normalising the international situation, one cannot but note that the Moscow summit could be more fruitful.

It would be just to say that the United States could have passed a bigger part of its half of the way toward the conclusion of the INF Treaty.

Since the Washington summit, the U.S. has not shown any progress on the problem of compliance with the ABM Treaty, nor displayed a constructive stand at talks on limiting sea-based cruise missiles, and is holding a groundless position on air-based cruise missiles.

The Soviet Union pins its most serious hopes on the Moscow summit. It proceeds from the idea that the very continuation of the Soviet-American dialogue at summit level is important and essential, as the Soviet and U.S. leaders will centre their attention during their further contacts on paramount issues of the present-day world.

There will appear a possibility to reach a new level of dialogue and mutual understanding, which will make it possible to enhance the level of mutual security in future.

All nations of the world will gain from this.