

Ronald Reagan Presidential Library Digital Library Collections

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

Collection: News Summary Office, White House:
News Summaries, 1981-1989

Series: II: WHITE HOUSE NEWS SUMMARY FINALS,
1981-1989

Folder Title: 11/17/1985

Box: 384

To see more digitized collections visit:

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

To see all Ronald Reagan Presidential Library Inventories, visit:

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

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

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

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



News Summary

OFFICE OF THE PRESS SECRETARY

GENEVA EVENING EDITION

4:30 P.M. EST -- SUNDAY, NOVEMBER 17, 1985 -- 10:30 P.M. GENEVA TIME

TODAY'S HEADLINES

TRIP NEWS

REAGAN PREPARING FOR SUMMIT -- A somber President Reagan, preparing for the first superpower summit in six years, feels ready to meet with Soviet leader Gorbachev to chart a "road map to a new relationship," Reagan's spokesman said Sunday. (UPI, AP, Reuter)

NETWORK ANCHORS ENGAGE IN 'STAR WARS' IN GENEVA -- The television networks will engage in their own version of "Star Wars" this week when their high-profile anchors report from Geneva during the superpower summit. (AP)

EUROPE LOOKS FOR IMPROVED EAST-WEST CLIMATE -- America's European allies say they hold "no exaggerated illusions," but hope this week's Geneva summit leads to "a better basis of confidence" when arms negotiators return to work in the months ahead. (AP)

NETWORK NEWS (Sunday Talk Shows)

WEINBERGER LETTER -- President Reagan's efforts to get the summit underway smoothly have been seriously disrupted by the Weinberger letter.

The Soviet delegation here seized upon Weinberger's letter accusing Americans of trying to sabotage the Reagan-Gorbachev summit.

TRIP NEWS.....A-2

INTERNATIONAL NEWS...A-6

NATIONAL NEWS.....A-7

NETWORK TALK SHOWS...B-1

TRIP NEWS

U.S. AND SOVIET OFFICIALS FAR APART ON MAIN SUMMIT ISSUES

GENEVA -- Senior U.S. and Soviet officials both said today that the Geneva summit should be a turning point in superpower relations, but remained far apart on the main issues their leaders will discuss. Presenting their negotiating platforms at news conferences in Geneva, spokesmen from the two sides set out widely divergent views on the central question of arms control and each accused the other of adopting unreasonable positions. Larry Speakes said the success of the summit should not be measured in terms of the agreements it produced but the way it forged a new basis for relations between Washington and Moscow. But Gen. Nikolai Chervov, a top arms control expert, sounded a deeply pessimistic note on the prospects of making progress on arms reductions during the talks.

(Patricia Wilson, Reuter)

REAGAN PREPARING FOR SUMMIT

GENEVA -- During a short walk with his wife Nancy at La Maison de Saussure, an 18th Century chateau on Lake Geneva that serves as his residence, Reagan was asked to name his top priority at the first superpower summit in six years. He responded with one word, "Peace."

The Administration spent Sunday trying to put aside a flap over a leaked letter about SALT II from Secretary Weinberger and to lower expectations that any major breakthroughs would come out of the 10th summit since World War II.... National Security Adviser Robert McFarlane called the leak "unfortunate" but said he didn't think the letter would be brought up when the two leaders meet. And Reagan said "Hell, no" when asked if Weinberger would be fired. But Georgi Arbatov, a key adviser to Gorbachev, called the leaked letter "a direct attempt to torpedo the whole arms negotiation process."

(Helen Thomas, UPI)

REAGAN IRRITATED AT LETTER CONTROVERSY BEFORE SUMMIT

GENEVA -- An irritated President Reagan today summarily dismissed questions on a leaked arms control letter from his defense secretary which has embarrassed the U.S. delegation here for this week's summit.... Earlier, both Larry Speakes and Robert McFarlane attempted to play down the impact of the Weinberger letter, saying the defense secretary's views were well known.

(Reuter)

LEAK OF LETTER EXPOSES DEEP SPLIT

GENEVA -- Sooner or later, President Reagan's inner-circle arms control dispute was bound to explode in public; it finally did, at the most embarrassing possible moment -- damaging the united front Reagan had hoped to take with him when he sits across the table from Gorbachev. The leak came as Administration moderates seemed to be gaining the upper hand on arms control.... While the Administration has sought to cover up its differences, the Weinberger letter again spotlights Reagan's difficulties in achieving unity among his own aides.

(Analysis by Gregory Nokes, AP)

-more-

TRIP NEWS (continued)

WEINBERGER: ODD MAN OUT -- AND CAUGHT IN THE MIDDLE

WASHINGTON -- Secretary Weinberger, called an "innocent bystander" by one aide, found himself the focus of controversy Sunday despite being the odd man out at the Reagan-Gorbachev summit.... The development added a new twist to the conflict between hard-line sentiments, as voiced by Weinberger, and the more conciliatory views espoused by Reagan's top foreign policy advisers, Secretary Shultz and National Security Adviser Robert McFarlane. What may have happened is that Shultz, McFarlane and Donald Reagan have written a new script for Reagan. Weinberger may still be reading from the old one, crafted before the agreement to hold the summit. (Richard Gross, UPI)

WASHINGTON -- Officials theorized the letter was disclosed by someone in the State Department in an effort to discredit Weinberger and the tough stance he had pursued toward refusing to surrender research on the SDI. "The very real conclusion is that somebody is out to get Weinberger and his point of view," one official said. (Richard Gross, UPI)

NETWORK ANCHORS ENGAGE IN 'STAR WARS' IN GENEVA

NEW YORK -- Pride, prestige and ratings will be at stake as Tom Brokaw, Peter Jennings and Dan Rather spearhead their network's coverage of the meeting between President Reagan and Gorbachev on Tuesday and Wednesday. "If you send your anchorpersons on the road, you tend to draw greater attention," said Jennings, anchor of ABC's "World News Tonight." Jennings said a traveling anchor means a larger commitment to a story, offering the opportunity to give it more depth and context. (Fred Rothenberg, AP)

POLITICS AND PEOPLE

WASHINGTON (Advance for Monday) -- You're probably tired of the Geneva summit already, and it hasn't even started.... Since the White House doesn't expect much to come of it either, there's no reason to think it'll have much long-term political impact unless Reagan comes off looking terribly weak or outrageously bellicose -- and either would be out of character for the Gipper. What it means for the history books is something else....

Right now, Reagan's major legacy lies in domestic policy -- as the biggest deficit-spender in the history of the American presidency. A breakthrough in foreign policy could shift that focus.

(Don Campbell, Gannett)

SOVIET OPENNESS UPSTAGES U.S., BUT NO POLICY SHIFT IS SEEN

GENEVA -- The Soviet Union is upstaging the U.S. in the game of public relations, but the new Kremlin openness reveals no shift in foreign policy.... U.S. officials acknowledge that Washington lost badly in the public relations contest with Gorbachev earlier this fall, but they believe Reagan has since pulled level by setting out his own summit agenda. (Analysis by Paul Taylor, Reuter)

-more-

TRIP NEWS (continued)

SOVIETS CITE WEINBERGER VIEWS, STAR WARS AS PROBLEMS

GENEVA -- Soviet officials, talking tough during a pre-summit briefing, said Sunday that the two-day meetings would be a "trial by fire" for President Reagan, and accused the U.S. of torpedoing any progress toward a superpower arms agreement. The officials would not discuss reports of a Soviet proposal to extend observation of the never-ratified SALT II agreement, saying the issue was one for discussion between Reagan and Gorbachev. (Roxinne Ervasti, AP)

KISSINGER SAYS REAGAN IN STRONG POSITION AT SUMMIT

LONDON -- Former Secretary of State Kissinger said Sunday that President Reagan will be in a strong negotiating position at his Geneva summit meeting with Gorbachev. Kissinger wrote in London's Sunday Observer that Reagan enjoys unmatched confidence from the American public, which he said will help Reagan in his meetings. Describing SDI as the "most revolutionary" new concept in arms control, Kissinger argued that criticism has obscured the breakthrough it has already achieved: "Soviet readiness to discuss arms control on an unprecedented scale." (AP)

POPE SENDS PERSONAL MESSAGE TO REAGAN AND GORBACHEV

VATICAN CITY -- Pope John Paul II said today he had sent a message to President Reagan and Gorbachev urging them to work for peace at their Geneva summit. He told a 10,000-strong crowd in St. Peter's Square for Sunday Angelus that the summit had raised hopes and expectations throughout the world. "No one can hide the obstacles which lie in the way of hoped-for agreements on the problems to be examined, especially that of the arms race," he said, calling for prayers for peace. (Reuter)

SOVIET JEWS IN ISRAEL CAUTIOUSLY HOPEFUL OVER SUMMIT

TEL AVIV -- Soviet Jews in Israel believe the meetings between Reagan and Gorbachev offer a long-awaited opportunity to persuade the Kremlin to open its emigration gates to Jewish "refuseniks," those who have sought, but been denied visas to leave.... On Sunday Prime Minister Shimon Peres told his Cabinet the Soviet Union has signaled willingness to discuss letting more Jews emigrate and asked that the issue be given special attention at the Geneva summit. Optimism rose when U.S. officials said the Soviets will allow 10 citizens with U.S. spouses or other U.S. ties to emigrate to the West. But whether Moscow would open its emigration doors wider was not know. (AP)

TRIP NEWS (continued)

NERVE GAS FIGURES IN POSSIBLE SUMMIT TOPICS

WASHINGTON -- When President Reagan and Gorbachev sit down in Geneva this week, one item on their agenda could be ways to halt the spread of nerve gas weapons around the globe. A recent Pentagon report noted that 11 Third World nations now have chemical weapons, while two more are trying to build them. (AP)

GEORGE SCHROEDER

SAN FRANCISCO -- George Schroeder, a construction planner, has flown to Geneva with 7,000 letters telling President Reagan and Gorbachev the world wants to build a foundation for solid peace. Schroeder, who was seen off Saturday at the airport by 40 friends, said he was troubled at the level of cynicism about the prospects for peace. Schroeder hopes to get the letters to aides of the world leaders and said he was certain "the President will come to know of these letters." (UPI)

NUCLEAR FREEZE CAMPAIGN

CHICAGO -- Arm control advocates from across the nation today sent a delegation to the superpower summit in Geneva to deliver a petition signed by over a million people calling for a ban on nuclear testing. The delegation is headed by the Rev. Jesse Jackson. (Reuter)

NANCY REAGAN ACTS GORBACHEV ROLE

GENEVA -- A lighthearted Nancy Reagan play-acted the role of Soviet leader Gorbachev for her husband Sunday during a visit to the scene of Tuesday's superpower talks. The First Lady's playfulness briefly relieved President Reagan's otherwise somber pre-summit mood. (Marie Colvin, UPI)

SUMMIT/JIMMY THE GREEK

NEW YORK -- Sports oddsmaker and CBS Television commentator Jimmy "the Greek" Snyder applied his prolific prognostication prowess Sunday to the superpower summit in Geneva, giving the Soviets the edge on offense, but the U.S. rates the better defense.... The Soviets win the "intangible" category because "Gorbachev is nothing but a Khrushchev in a \$700 suit," the Greek said. (UPI)

THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT

WASHINGTON (Advance for Monday) -- With President Reagan in Geneva, one might assume that Vice President Bush is running the Oval Office. Not so.... Rather, modern communication has made it possible for the White House to operate out of Geneva.... Frequent telephone calls keep the President and his men appraised of the business of government -- that includes transmitting daily News Summaries and tapes of network television news shows. (Norm Brewer, Gannett)

INTERNATIONAL NEWS

FRONTLINE FIGHTING BEHIND SOVIET AFGHAN LOSSES, ANALYSTS SAY

ISLAMABAD -- Soviet casualties in Afghanistan have risen this year because Moscow was obligated to draft many more troops into frontline fighting against Moslem rebels, Western and Pakistani military analysts said today.... The analysts doubted that increased arms supplies to the rebels could be the reason for the increase in Soviet dead and wounded this year. They were commenting on statements by Soviet spokesmen in Geneva yesterday blaming supplies of sophisticated arms to the rebels for Soviet losses in Afghanistan. (Reuter)

BRITISH ENVOY TO BRIEF U.S. OFFICIALS ON KIDNAPPED AMERICANS

BEIRUT -- British church envoy Terry Waite said he would leave Beirut today to brief U.S. officials on his efforts to win freedom for American hostages in Lebanon.... In Geneva, Larry Speakes said the Reagan Administration had not yet heard from Waite. "We have not received any expressions from him," Speakes said at a briefing. But he said the Administration would be willing to meet Waite in Geneva, London or Washington. (Reuter)

WAITE MEETS KIDNAPPERS, LEAVE LEBANON

BEIRUT -- Terry Waite said Sunday he met the captors at a secret meeting in Beirut and "positive steps have been taken." ... Waite's meeting was seen as the first real breakthrough in the long-running hostage drama. (AP)

SHULTZ SEES U.S. ENVOY ON EFFORT TO FREE HOSTAGES

GENEVA -- Secretary Shultz today met the American Ambassador to Lebanon to discuss efforts to free four American hostages held there. Shultz said Ambassador Reginald Bartholomew had told him, "There seems to be more pressure on the situation right now." (Reuter)

U.S. OFFICER LAYS WREATH AT BITBURG IN REMEMBRANCE SERVICE

BITBURG, West Germany -- A senior U.S. Air Force officer today laid a wreath at the Bitburg German War Cemetery visited last May by President Reagan in one of the hundreds of Remembrance Day services in West Germany. Col. Peter Robinson, commander of the 36th Tactical Fighter Wing at Bitburg U.S. Air Base, headed an eight-person military delegation from the base and laid the wreath of flowers at the stone war memorial which overlooks the graves. (Reuter)

U.S. OFFICIALS IN HANOI FOR MIA SEARCH

HANOI -- Experts assembled Sunday for the first joint U.S.-Vietnamese excavation of an American warplane crash site -- considered a breakthrough in the decade-long dispute over servicemen listed as missing in action. (UPI)

-more-

NATIONAL NEWS

U.S. DEBT AND BUDGET DILEMMA AWAITS REAGAN RETURN

WASHINGTON -- While President Reagan attends the Geneva summit, a major financial crisis has been deferred back home, assuring him the U.S. has cash on hand and can honor its gigantic debts -- for a few weeks. But when he returns with whatever success may be achieved in talks with Gorbachev, the problem of the massive U.S. debt will again top the domestic policy agenda. (Michael Posner, Reuter)

ROSTENKOWSKI SAYS TAX REFORM EFFORT COULD BE SHOT DOWN

WASHINGTON -- Rep. Dan Rostenkowski said Sunday he's confident his House Ways and Means Committee can write a tax-overhaul bill greatly improving today's system, but acknowledged that several pending issues could torpedo the effort.... He said he hopes the committee can complete work on the bill on Friday. (AP)

WASHINGTON -- Indicating a long week ahead for the committee, Rostenkowski said, "I'd like nothing better than to give the President a bill when he gets off the helicopter from Geneva" but it will not be done that quickly. Rostenkowski said that Reagan "has been very cooperative" and added, "I hope that on the (House) floor he can move more Republicans than he has in committee." (UPI)

PENTAGON ACCUSED OF PURGING FRAUD INVESTIGATORS

ST. LOUIS -- The Pentagon's Office of Inspector General has replaced its entire contract fraud staff over the past two months in what sources suspect was a purge of agents who favor more aggressive action on defense fraud investigations, a copyright report (in the St. Louis Post-Dispatch) said Sunday. (UPI)

-end-of-A-section-

White House News Summary -- Sunday Morning Talk Shows - B-1

ABC's THIS WEEK WITH DAVID BRINKLEY

Moderator: David Brinkley. Panel: George Will, Sam Donaldson. Peter Jennings. Guests: Yevgeny Velikov, USSR Academy of Sciences, Vitaly Zhurkin, Deputy Director US-Canada Institute, Secretary George Shultz.

ABC's PETER JENNINGS reports the President and Mrs. Reagan had a brief walk in the garden of their temporary residence here.

(TV coverage: The President and Mrs. Reagan walking in the garden.)

The rest of the time Mr. Reagan has been doing his homework for the meetings with Mr. Gorbachev. The big flap here today has been the letter which Secretary Weinberger wrote to Mr. Reagan and which was leaked to the press.

ABC's STEVE SHEPARD reports President Reagan's efforts to get the summit underway smoothly have been seriously disrupted by the Weinberger letter. This morning on his way to a meeting with his advisors, a clearly irritated Ronald Reagan tried some damage control.

(TV coverage: The President walking with Shultz, McFarlane and Regan.)

(Reporter: "Are you going to fire Weinberger? The President: "Do you want a two word answer or one?" Reporter: "Two." The President: "Hell no.")

Later the President openly questioned press reports that a senior Administration official characterized the publication of the Weinberger letter as an attempt to sabotage the summit.

(TV coverage: The President sitting with Shultz, McFarlane and Regan. The President: "I'm wondering if that individual is not a figment of someone is the press' imagination.")

Larry Speakes said the Weinberger letter should have no effect on the summit because it repeats views that have been made public before.

(Larry Speakes: "I'd be willing to put five bucks right here that General Secretary Gorbachev will not say a word about the Weinberger letter.")

Plenty of reporters were willing to take that bet. The Soviets have often portrayed the Reagan Administration as insincere and inflexible on arms control and seen in that light, the Weinberger letter may be just too juicy to pass-up.

ABC's WALTER ROGERS reports the Soviet delegation here has seized upon Weinberger's letter accusing certain Americans of trying to sabotage the Reagan-Gorbachev summit.

(Georgi Arbatov through translator: "This is a direct attempt to torpedo the whole arms limitation process.")

The Soviets offered a negative assessment of summit prospects warning unless Star Wars is abandoned, no cuts in strategic nuclear weapons can be agreed to here. The Soviets, now teasing, are saying when Mikhail Gorbachev arrives tomorrow, he will not come empty handed, and it was clear today that the Russians don't want anything to derail the summit now.

BRINKLEY: There is a great disagreement between your country and ours on the development of Star Wars...what exactly is your position?

VELIKOV: First of all, I think it is one version which was very clearly expressed by Secretary General Gorbachev in his interview with Time. I personally have no disagreement with the Pentagon version, because in the Pentagon definition, the basic research is research....

-more-

White House News Summary - Sunday, November 17, 1985 - B-2

THIS WEEK (continued)

WILL: Do you think Strategic Defense will work?

VELIKOV: First of all, I think today there are three types of the Strategic Defense Initiative. One, the so-called Star Wars one which is directed to build a comprehensive shield against nuclear weapons, to make them absolutely impotent. In my estimation and many other scientist's, it is a complete illusion....

WILL: Are you not in the Soviet Union doing ground and space based laser research, particle beam research, and other space related strategic defense programs?

VELIKOV: We have no research directed to the development of such types of weapons....

DONALDSON: Mr. Zhurkin, will Mr. Gorbachev propose a one year extension on the provisions of the SALT II treaty when he meets with Mr. Reagan this week?

ZHURKIN: You know, first of all, it is very difficult for me to predict what Mr. Gorbachev is going to propose, but generally speaking, in relation to the existing treaty, I don't think it would be a very good idea to prolong the existing treaty....

BRINKLEY: Mr. Reagan will meet Mr. Gorbachev during the coming days, you have already met him, you've already spent some hours with him talking, and I gather doing a little arguing. Tell us about him will you, about him and about your meeting.

SHULTZ: Our meeting was a strong conversation, and I thought he was very direct about what he wanted to say, and so was I. It went on a long time. They were the kinds of conversations where you interrupt back and forth, and I thought it was a worthwhile exchange, I was glad to have had it.

BRINKLEY: Did anything he said surprise you?

SHULTZ: Well, not really although it's always surprising, I suppose, to hear your country described in a way that you don't think conforms to the reality.

WILL: On the subject of SALT II, on June 10th the President said we would continue the no under-cut policy, but we are looking for improved compliance from the Soviet Union. That's five months ago now plus some, has there been any improved compliance?

SHULTZ: There have been some things take place by way of Soviet activities, however, the President's position remains exactly as it was then. His policy is that he will maintain interim restraint under the SALT II agreements, observing Soviet behavior including what progress there may or may not be in the negotiations on arms control.

THIS WEEK (continued)

WILL: But since June 10th the federal government has made a pronounced statement about the deployment of mobile missiles. That would seem to imply that their compliance is worse now than it was in June.

SHULTZ: The deployment of a second missile is a violation of SALT II in our opinion and I think it is a pretty open and shut case myself, it is not a modernization of an existing missile. There isn't a prohibition on mobile missiles, although we think that mobile missiles should be prohibited because they give a very tough verification problem, particularly if they can rove around throughout the vast reaches of the regions of the Soviet Union.

DONALDSON: Secretary Weinberger's letter to the President...urged the President to hang tough, not make a deal here in Geneva on extending the provisions of SALT II. One: are you saying he won't make such a deal here, and two: you just heard a Soviet official say that he thought you were offended that that letter was leaked, is that correct?

SHULTZ: I have no sense of offense. I think that so much leaks in Washington these days, that what does offend me is the lack of discipline in the government, in that so much, and many damaging things do leak that this is just a relatively minor example.

DONALDSON: Do you sense that, perhaps at this summit, Gorbachev gives a little and the President is able to accommodate a little bit, you might be able to remove this obstacle of SDI from an ability to go forward on arms reduction?

SHULTZ: The President is determined to find the answer to the question: Is it possible to construct a shield that will protect us in some measure against ballistic missiles? And we have a program that is designed and in operation. So far as I can tell, we believe that program will give us an answer to that question, and there is no way the President can be persuaded not to continue seeking that answer. And I might say further, there is no one, in the group of people that are advising the President, who believes that he should do anything except continue to find that answer.

WILL: One of the possible agreements that's talked about is one in which the two sides agree to work against the spread of chemical weapons. Since the Soviet Union is using chemical weapons according to the U.S. position wouldn't that be the thing to go after, not some rather innocuous agreement on the spread?

SHULTZ: There are many things that should be gone. We have tabled a comprehensive chemical weapons ban on production and use in Geneva and we think that ought to be pursued. Obviously, use of chemical weapons is deplorable. It's also true that chemical weapons are spreading and I think the proliferation of them represents one the biggest problems we face. I think they see that too.

WILL: Will there be a joint communique at the end of the summit?

SHULTZ: It remains to be what will be the way of reporting the meeting.

###

CBS's FACE THE NATION

Moderator: Lesley Stahl.

Guests: Donald Regan, White House Chief of Staff;
Georgi Arbatov, Adviser to Mikhail Gorbachev.

STAHL: Mr. Regan. Now, there are reports that the President's grumpy today. Is he in a bad mood?

REGAN: No, he's in a very good mood. He's very upbeat. He's looking forward to the meeting on Tuesday. He's ready for it.

STAHL: He is. With only one day to the Summit, you find yourself totally embroiled with internal squabbles in your Administration. Secretary Weinberger has written the President a letter that was leaked to "The New York Times" urging him not to commit to SALT II. One other official says that it was an attempt to sabotage the Summit. What kind of a way is this to go into the meeting with Mr. Gorbachev?

REGAN: It's a normal way. You've got to remember: the President doesn't surround himself with "yes" men or people who just think along one line. He gets diverse opinions, and then from those he chooses. He's made up his mind. He knows how he's going to handle these questions.

STAHL: Now, Mr. Gorbachev told Secretary of State Shultz when he was in Moscow that this Administration is completely controlled by the military-industrial complex. With a situation like this, why shouldn't that impression be even more hardened in Mr. Gorbachev's mind?

REGAN: Because you have to listen to Ronald Reagan's words in order to detect what Ronald Reagan, who is our leader, is saying. And he's saying, he's here for peace. He is no creature of any military-industrial complex.

STAHL: What about arms control agreements at this Summit? There are now reports that Mr. Gorbachev may come here with a new proposal. Is there any possibility at all -- disregard all the lowerings of expectations that we've been treated to -- any possibility at all that there will be some joint statement on arms control? Any kinds of guidelines issued?

REGAN: Well, that's a possibility. But I would say that, for the most part, what we could expect would be that the leaders would discuss between themselves the overall aspects of it. We do have the negotiators here in Geneva whose job it is to go through the tedious parts of arms control. I wouldn't expect anything of that nature to come from the leaders. But an overall agreement in principle on how they want to proceed, that's a possibility.

STAHL: How close?

REGAN: How close? Why, I could not answer that. I haven't heard what the General Secretary's point of view is as yet. We'll hear that on Tuesday and Wednesday.

FACE THE NATION (continued)

STAHL: Have you also heard that he's coming with a new arms control proposal?

REGAN: No, we have not heard any such thing. Ours is the latest proposal that's on the table.

STAHL: Why do we think -- why our officials think -- Mr. Gorbachev was so tough and combative with George Shultz? What do you think the strategy was there?

REGAN: Well, I don't know where that impression came from. What Secretary Shultz reported to us was that there was a lively give-and-take. But tough and combative were not two words that he used to describe the General Secretary. He said that he held his positions firmly -- things of that nature. But I suspect that this man knows what he wants and is an advocate. He's a lawyer and he can put forth his cause very clearly.

STAHL: Well, are you expecting to see that Gorbachev, or are you expecting to see the one who charmed Margaret Thatcher? There seem to be two sides.

REGAN: I don't know. This is up to Mr. Gorbachev, which way he wants to play it.

STAHL: What's your strategy? Which way will the President play it?

REGAN: President Reagan is a congenial man and a man who likes to give and take in discourse. And I think that you'll find that that type of Ronald Reagan is the type that you will see. A man who knows his positions, is firm in them. But a man who will come across very clearly and very definitely on how he thinks we can get along.

STAHL: You said the other day, I believe, that he's coming to this meeting with his forty years of experience in dealing with Communists -- pretty much an anti-Communist perspective. What exactly did you mean to convey?

REGAN: Well, that this is not something new for Ronald Reagan -- to discuss Communism or United States-Soviet relationships. You've got to remember that this is an ongoing relationship for the last fifty years that we've had with the Soviets. Now, from that point of view, Ronald Reagan understands how he views the Soviet Union. And he knows, and we know. They're not going to convince us that their way of life is better or that their philosophy is one we should adopt. Nor are we going to convince them that ours is the best. But we have to find a way to live.

STAHL: Does President Reagan want to have future Summits?

REGAN: If the General Secretary is willing.

FACE THE NATION (continued)

STAHL: I wanted to ask you a question about why the negative talk. But let me interrupt myself for a minute and ask you if you're not ending up with the very kind of Summit that your side -- the White House -- said you never wanted? Which is one that is basically unprepared. You come here, I gather from what you are saying, really not knowing what's going to happen. And how did you find yourself in this predicament?

REGAN: Well, wait a minute. Back up a minute. How can you possibly say that we don't know or that we would know what is going to happen? How can you write a script in advance for something?

STAHL: Well, isn't that what you wanted to do originally?

REGAN: No, far from it. We knew the topics that that we wanted to discuss. We have those topics in mind. They're very simple: arms control, bilateral arrangements, human rights. We know what we want to discuss. But from the point of view of the outcome of those, there's no way that you can predict what the outcome will be when two nations of our size meet.

STAHL: You're leaving a lot up to what happens between the two men in the room.

REGAN: That's the purpose of a Summit....

STAHL: Let me ask you very quickly about human rights. The Soviets have said they'll allow nine spouses of American citizens to leave. Is this a new policy on their part?

REGAN: No, this has been done at practically every Summit. They release a few people. Where are the rest of the people? That's just a pittance and a mere pittance at that. Why don't they release all of the people? Why do they keep their borders closed?

STAHL: Is that the same kind of tough answer the President is going to give Mr. Gorbachev?

REGAN: That's a realistic answer. You might ask your other guest on the program how he would answer that.

STAHL: The "x" factor. How concerned are you that Ronald Reagan is going to make mistakes, inaccuracies, deviate from whatever script you've given him.

REGAN: We haven't given him a script, let me get that straight at this time. The man knows what he's talking about. If there's an occasional slip, anyone can slip on a fact or two. That can be corrected rather easily. It's the principles. He'll never slip on principles.

FACE THE NATION (continued)

STAHL: With us now in Geneva, Georgi Arbatov, an adviser to Soviet General Secretary Gorbachev on American affairs and a member of the Soviet Central Committee. Is Mr. Gorbachev coming to this Summit with some new arms control proposals, Mr. Arbatov?

ARBATOV: He promised that he won't come with empty hands. But that doesn't mean that would I know, I would never spill it before TV.

STAHL: Why not? Feel free.

ARBATOV: Thank you. Anyway, it will become known in the next few days, but he expects also President Reagan to come with something. Not only nice smiles and fatherly advice.

STAHL: I was told that U.S. officials have been dismayed that your side has not repeated Mr. Gorbachev's offer in "Time" magazine to accept some research on "Star Wars." Is that likely to be what Mr. Gorbachev is bringing to Geneva?

ARBATOV: You know, in this setting, you misrepresent the whole problem. We reject the whole idea of "Star Wars." We consider it to be destruction of ABM treaty, and also destruction of the whole structure of arms control agreement in the regime in which we have, as modest as it is. And the whole process of arms control negotiations. The question is, what the ABM treaty allows and what it forbids. It allows fundamental research. Fundamental research is research of nature. If when at the moment you start to make research and development on a weapon which is forbidden by the treaty, you violate that treaty. And this is what we are against. Otherwise everything in general -- what he has said to "Time" magazine -- it remains true.

STAHL: I think Americans are wondering what I asked Mr. Regan. And that is, which Mr. Gorbachev will come to the Summit? Will it be the one who interrupted George Shultz and, by other reports, was combative? Or will he be charming and affable as he was in Paris and London?

ARBATOV: Well, you know, I think that it's better not to make any forecast. As with any human being, he also, in his behavior, usually reacts to the treatment he gets from the other side. But in this case, with Shultz, I simply don't know actually what offended him. That he told that this is a very conservative government. I think would he say that this is a very liberal government, they would be offended. Not in this case. The "they" are influenced by military-industrial complex. But they are, in today's story with this letter, it proves it. And military-industrial complex is not a word coined by Marxists. It was coined actually by a conservative Republican president of the United States. By President Eisenhower. So, I don't know what you are offended about? He told the truth.

STAHL: What is the Soviet reaction to the Weinberger letter and the story of disagreement?

FACE THE NATION (continued)

ARBATOV: I don't know what the official reaction is, but we feel what we talked about, there is a very strong fight not simply of different opinions but of different political lines. One -- for cold war and arms race, which is represented by Weinberger's letter. And I think it was actually intended to influence, to mobilize, opinion on the right to induce more pressure on President Reagan. And there is also some moderate opinion, and I hope the President here will represent this moderate opinion, realistic opinion.

STAHL: Is there not that spectrum of opinion around Mr. Gorbachev as well?

ARBATOV: No, no, no. As far as I know. Well, you know, maybe it's just part of our history. A country which lost more than twenty million people in last war has, as it's highest priority, peace....

STAHL: Let me ask you about human rights. The granting of exit visas to the spouses of American citizens. Is this signaling a new policy on emigration? Will you now allow the Jews who want to leave the Soviet Union to leave?

ARBATOV: You know, we consider it to be our own business like your, for instance, laws on immigration. I think what you did in Tucson with this priest who has given political refuge to some refugees from terroristic regimes in Central America is immoral. But we don't put it as a question of our relations. So here, we -- you -- have to leave it to ourselves. And I think that really there must be less hypocrisy in these things. The Yurchenko case. And outright state terrorism case....

STAHL: Why did you all believe so readily that this Mr. Yurchenko, the KGB man, was kidnapped? Why didn't you believe that he was a defector?

ARBATOV: I know the story, and we have four or five similar stories on which we expect answers of people who were lost. But I don't want to raise it before the Summit.

STAHL: But let me raise with you why you so readily bought his story. Why you didn't suspect that he came over and gave the CIA all your secrets?

ARBATOV: Well, you know, under drugs maybe, he has given secrets. If you put all the things together, there is no other answer. And you have to have at least a Congressional investigation into this; then you'll find the answer.

STAHL: What's going to happen to Mr. Yurchenko now?

ARBATOV: I think he behaved in a very brave way.

STAHL: So he'll get his job back.

ARBATOV: Of course.

FACE THE NATION (continued)

STAHL: Let me ask you, back on human rights for a minute. U.S. officials say they're expecting some big surprise on human rights. Is it possible that Andrei Sakharov will be allowed to leave the Soviet Union with his wife Elena Bonner?

ARBATOV: Well, you said that it will be a surprise. It will be a surprise to me as well. I don't know anything about it.

STAHL: Afghanistan. When you have been sitting with your colleagues briefing reporters here in Geneva, you have said as a group that your country would like to have a political settlement in Afghanistan.

ARBATOV: Yes.

STAHL: The United States government said this morning that they would like to see any settlement end up with an independent nonallied government. Is that what you would like to see as well?

ARBATOV: We cannot decide over the heads of the Afghanistan, that particular government. But in general the United States is not an onlooker. It is a participant in this conflict. Arms, rebel groups which fight against us. And assistance of the United States would be welcome....

STAHL: Will you discuss this with Mr. Reagan or will Mr. Gorbachev seek Mr. Reagan's help in reaching this political settlement?

ARBATOV: You know, it is not seeking help. It's done to a much degree by Americans, in our point of view, the whole conflict. So if the Americans are ready to change their opinion and be helpful in introducing peaceful settlement, we'll be ready to work with them.

STAHL: You've been here briefing reporters, poking a little fun, actually ridiculing Mr. Reagan for studying videotapes.

ARBATOV: Not ridiculing. I have respect to this old gentlemen, and I like his words with which he has come to Geneva. That he wants to make a fresh start. I think it will be really important after so many years of anti-Communism and anti-Sovietism to make a fresh start in their relations with the Soviet Union.

STAHL: What's your final expectation? Are you optimistic?

ARBATOV: I am less pessimistic than I was, and I would say that this happens at a crucial moment. We simply have no right -- both our countries and both leaders of our countries -- they must have responsibility enough to understand that they have no right not to come to some rapport and to change the situation as it is. It is so dangerous and so critical. So I wish them all the best, really. Both of them.

NBC'S MEET THE PRESS

Moderator: Marvin Kalb. Panel: Tom Brokaw, John Chancellor.

Guests: Michael Deaver; Julyan Semyonov, Gorbachev Adviser; Helmut Schmidt; Sen. Sam Nunn; Dr. Roald Sagdeev, Soviet space expert; Robert McFarlane.

KALB: Well in the last month of preparation for this summit, there really hasn't been terribly much that is secret, including a leaking just a couple of days ago of the Weinberger letter. Could you tell us in your view whether the President is deeply upset by the leaking of that letter?

DEAVER: I have no way to know. I haven't seen him since before he left. So, all I have are the accounts like all the rest of us of reading it in the newspapers.

KALB: You think it can upset the President's timing, his preparation for the summit?

DEAVER: No, I don't think so. I think the President obviously is upset by any kind of leakage of confidential information, particularly a private letter, but I don't think this will alter one way or the other the President's attitudes or desires going into the summit.

CHANCELLOR: Mr. Deaver, you've been advising the President leading up to the summit. Is there something different about this one? The White House talks about fundamental differences. Can you describe the way that this summit might work the way past summits haven't?

DEAVER: Well, really this is, you know, so much of any summit is the chemistry of the two men. So, it's very hard to compare this summit with any other summit. You've got the chemistry of two new fellows on the block and after all the ballyhoo and the public relations and the speculation by the media, it really boils down to what happens when the two of them get behind those two doors and the doors shut.

CHANCELLOR: Well, but with all respect, they are not going on a date. They're representing countries with hundreds of advisors who have policies and plans and programs and proposals and all of that. I might say that when you do hear what the White House is talking about the chemistry of the two men, where's the substance in all this?

DEAVER: Well, there is no question there is a good deal of substance in all of this, and I can only talk from the American side and tell you that I believe that Ronald Reagan has been preparing for this meeting for a decade or more. It isn't just the preparation and cramming that has come in the last 3 or 4 weeks. This man wants the meeting, has always wanted this meeting, and is ready and up for it.

BROKAW: Mr. Deaver, the President has a long and well publicized record of a personal disdain and suspicion of the Soviets and their system, and yet as I understand it, he is going to persuade Gorbachev that the United States and he, personally, is not hostile to the Soviets. Do you think that he can personally rewrite his own history?

MEET THE PRESS (continued)

DEAVER: Oh, I wouldn't sell Ronald Reagan short on being persuasive on any subject with anybody and I think he feels very secure in his ability to be persuasive and communicate his real feelings to this Soviet leader.

BROKAW: But the Russians generally and Gorbachev particularly have always made it clear that they look after their own national interest. It was just about a year ago that Gorbachev was saying that great powers don't have allies, they have national interests. And isn't that what he's going to be looking to as the President will be as well?

DEAVER: Well, I suppose so. I think that is one of the great differences between the two men. Mr. Gorbachev says the great power don't have allies. That simply isn't true with the West. We have the strongest alliance we've had in 20 years with this President going into this summit, so we'll just have to wait and see.

KALB: Mr Deaver, did the President get preped for this summit in much the same way that he got preped for example for a Presidential debate?

DEAVER: No, no he didn't. And really there wasn't the need for the kind of preparation that you need for a stand-up debate where all kinds of questions come from all different kinds of people. As I said before, the President has been preparing for this meeting for a long time and he's had daily briefings, and discussions and meetings for 4 1/2 years on this subject. There hasn't been a subject that's been more important to him. So it didn't take a great deal of cramming to go into this summit.

KALB: Mr. Deaver if he was preparing for this meeting for 10 years, why did it take him 4 1/2 years to get to it?

DEAVER: Well, I think you might have to ask the Soviet leadership that. Ronald Reagan was willing from the very first time he came to office. In fact, wrote to Brezhnev when he was in the hospital after he was shot suggesting such a meeting, and has been willing and has suggested that with every Soviet leader that he served opposite with. So I can't answer that. Ronald Reagan has been willing to go any place to have any kind of meeting with the Soviet leader since he took office.

KALB: Mr. Semyonov, I want to begin with a very obvious question, you are a novelist. You are a very good one. What are you doing here performing as a diplomat?

SEMYONOV: Well, let's say so. I am here for some reasons. First, I have a teacher in literature. He is American. His name Ernest Hemingway. And he visited Geneva in 21 when Chairman Nomenre, minister of Foreign Affairs and Germany Rockinw signed a peaceful agreement was signed. Second one. I am not a politician, I am a writer. Thank God. That's why I am more emotional than politicians and you know writer's emotions they are greater than other emotions and even women's emotions. That's why it's possible for me to analyze the situation. I am absolutely open minded. Third one. I am going, well I'm going later to write a book and of course, because I do really like my leader and I'm sure that this summit is a unique chance to preserve ourselves, to save civilization. That's why I'm here.

MEET THE PRESS (continued)

Guest: Julyan Semyonov.

BROKAW: Mr. Semyonov, as a writer, you must have a very fundamental understanding of fundamental human rights. One of the great puzzles in our country is why in your system, the people who want to leave the Soviet Union just aren't free to do so when they want to go?

SEMYONOV: Well, it's a special theme for discussion. To answer your question, tomorrow we'll have a press conference about this subject but you know, there is a lot of speculation about the subject and to date, if you've been in press center, you saw this candle and one woman, I didn't know her, began to cry, and so on and so on. It's another public diplomacy. It's a kind of provocation.

CHANCELLOR: Mr. Semyonov: Let me ask you one brief question as one journalist writer to a literary writer, why should we trust the Russians? Why should we trust the Soviet regime?

SEMYONOV: Well, okay, because we were allies during our war against Nazis. In spite of many problems, we were allies. Before that, we had Franklin Delano Roosevelt, who is very popular in my country. Third reason, because most popular Soviet writers is Ernest Hemingway, Faulkner, Gore Vidal, and so on and so on. And Russians like Americans, you know.

Guest: Helmut Schmidt.

KALB: Mr. Schmidt, I like to ask you your opinion of the whole impact of this public diplomacy. Is it viewed with seriousness in Western Europe?

SCHMIDT: Well it seems to me that so far there has been too much publicity, too much propaganda, public attacks and condemnations on each other which makes it very difficult to reach prudent compromises. Less spectacular media, therefore, would be advantageous to the probability to the positive results of the meeting. From a European point of view, it is high time that the two leaders get together and the least that the Europeans are entitled to ask for is that the two super powers do obey the treaties that they have undertaken, namely in the first place, the nonproliferation treaty, where in Article VI, the two super powers have undertaken to diminish their nuclear arsenals which they haven't done so far; and secondly, the anti-ballistic missile treaty, where you know they have divergencies in interpretation of the treaty. Divergencies between Moscow and Washington, but even inside Washington as it seems to appear. Secondly, the European interests, of course, have to be taken care of in these negotiations and there are some differences of interest between the European powers. You have the nuclear powers like France and Britain, and then you have the great majorities of non nuclear European states. And it is not going to be easy for President Reagan to pursue the American interest as well as these differing European interests.

MEET THE PRESS (continued)

BROKAW: Mr. Schmidt, as you know, Defense Secretary Weinberger has advised the President not to extend the SALT II agreement and to be very careful about any changes in the ABM Treaty that would not let the Administration go forward with research on SDI. Do you think it would be a good idea for the President not to agree to an extension of the ABM Treaty and also the 1972 SALT Treaty?

SCHMIDT: Well, I think that these treaties so far have been the pillars on which the whole enterprise of limiting the nuclear arms race and eventually stopping the arms race has been based upon. It would be very dangerous to let these treaties, especially the nonproliferation treaty and the ABM Treaty, elapse or let them decay. I think what is necessary is a joint interpretation in order to avoid the mutual accusations which we have been hearing the Americans have accused the Russians of violating the ABM Treaty. The Russians do accuse the Americans of having the intention to violate the treaty. I think a joint-interpretation is what the world does need in this field, and of course, the treaty is rather to be amended than to let it decay.

CHANCELLOR: Mr. Schmidt, if the summit at Geneva should break down and no progress is made here, some of us believe it is likely that the Soviets will mount an intensified public relations political campaign in Western Europe and Japan, trying to make their point in Japan and Western Europe. A point that they might not have been able to make to the Americans here. If they did that, how well would they do, sir?

SCHMIDT: I do not think that it is very likely that we see a breakdown of the negotiations in Geneva. I think the full impact of this meeting between the two heads of state or heads of the party and head of state, the full impact would only be seen in the later course of January once the two arms limitation delegations get together again in Geneva. I think this will be after the 15th of January. And whether they agree on something new at the present summit meeting or not, they would certainly have to make it appear as being a meeting that has contributed to further progress in the field of arms limitation. A breakdown, of course, would be a disaster. And not only for the two super powers and their population, but also, of course for the Europeans. In case of a breakdown, it would, of course, be of enormous importance as regards the question who is responsible for the breakdown. But I would like to repeat I do not calculate a breakdown. I think they have both two big interests at stake and that they will avoid a breakdown.

KALB: Mr. Schmidt, in the 30 seconds that we have left in this part of the interview, could you tell us whether you believe that President Reagan should make some major compromise on strategic defense in order to get a major agreement?

SCHMIDT: I think both sides have to make compromises. Both sides have to be willing for compromise and both sides should make compromises within the framework of the existing treaty which cover SDI as much as any other method of shooting down the adversaries' missiles.

MEET THE PRESS (continued)

Guest: Sen. Sam Nunn.

KALB: Sen. Nunn, do you think that the leaking of the Weinberger letter is going to complicate the President's efforts here in the summit?

NUNN: I see that letter as like the 13th shime of a clock. It not only is a bizarre sound coming at this point, but it also casts considerable doubt on everything else emanating from that source. I think the intention of the leak probably was to reduce the President's flexibility. I think the result of the leak has been very damaging because it feeds right into the Soviets' propaganda machine.

CHANCELLOR: Senator, let me ask you about the overall negotiations here. The Soviets have made quite an offer. Some people are saying it's the most forthcoming offer on arms control the Soviet Union has ever made. It involves a wide range of weapons. Shouldn't we in the face of this offer be a little more flexible on the strategic defense initiative on Star Wars, what's your view?

NUNN: I think both sides have to be more flexible on defense. I think we have to have offensive and defensive discussions together. Certainly, the offensive progress will affect or should affect our defensive plans because if we can get the Soviets to cut back there substantially on their large merved ICBMs, it certainly will affect our defensive needs and plans. The Soviets have been very rigid in interpreting the ABM Treaty....The logical point for both sides is to interpret the ABM Treaty as it was originally intended by the parties.

BROKAW: Senator, I was just going to ask whether you think that we ought to have an extension of SALT II which lapses at the end of this year and whether there ought to be a common agreement on the interpretation of the ABM Treaty.

NUNN: Well, on the latter point, definitely. If the two sides could instruct the negotiators in Geneva to search for a common interpretation of the ABM Treaty, I think it would be a very substantial and positive gain at the summit. On the question of SALT II extension, the President really has already made that decision. He made it in the summer. That does not mean it's going to be extended for a long time, but that was the strange thing about the Weinberger letter to me because he was rehashing arguments that the Pentagon, or at least the Secretary of Defense, lost in the summer debate. The question is whether we extend it through 86 and 87. The argument in that Weinberger letter was the damage that would be done if we extended through 1991, and no one is even talking about that.

Guest: Dr. Roald Sagdeev.

BROKAW: Dr. Sagdeev, is that a good idea for the negotiators here in Geneva to agree on a common interpretation of ABM.

DR. SAGDEEV: Yes, it would be a very good idea and I think it would be very good to come back to the original spirit of that treaty because thank God we can benefit from the people who really invented this treaty.

-more-

MEET THE PRESS (continued)

CHANCELLOR: But Dr. Sagdeev, the Soviet Union, in the view of many people, not just Americans, has violated the treaty itself.

DR. SAGDEEV: Let me give as an answer a few lines. First of all, what is seen now from this page is just a very large piece of concrete, which could be interpreted as a future radar, maybe from 5 or 6 years from now, and this type of technology also could be used for peaceful purposes.

BROKAW: Dr. Sagdeev, do you think that the President's idea of switching from nuclear equation that relies on offensive weapons to defensive systems is a good idea?

DR. SAGDEEV: Well personally, I have spent a lot of my time during the last several years and it is my very deep personal belief that it is not so.

KALB: Dr. Sagdeev, is there any room for compromise in your view and the view of the other members of the Soviet delegation on the issue of Star Wars? In other words, would you agree to some kind of a deal struck here in Geneva according to which the United States could continue to test those weapons systems now being tested and put a cap on new weapon systems to be tested?

DR. SAGDEEV: This is a very complicated issue. If you would like to go into the details. I think it would be very bad for all of us, not only for Russians, for Americans also and for the rest of the world to compromise on the expense of common security.

CHANCELLOR: Dr. Sagdeev, if the International Institute of Strategic Studies in London says that the Soviet Union has an active strategic defense program that's on going, can you tell the American people in this program what that consists of. You people say it's not threatening. What does it consist of?

DR. SAGDEEV: What is really going on is a continuation of activity completely under the umbrella of former ABM Treaty, which means defense anti-ballistic defense of the local area which was specified in the agreement.

CHANCELLOR: Would that be directed energy weapons or other energy weapons involved in that?

DR. SAGDEEV: It is based on the interceptors, rocket interceptors.

KALB: Dr. Sagdeev, Mr. McFarlane, who will be on this program very shortly, says that the Soviet Union has the most advanced Star Wars SDI program in the entire world. Now you are there in the midst of that, is he expressing what is true?

MEET THE PRESS (continued)

DR. SAGDEEV: You know, usually I am following what my colleagues scientists are saying, so I would like to refer to this particular time the reference to their statement from George Kiewerthy who is as I understand the chief scientific counselor of the government. And he said quite simply and I can quote his sayings during several speeches that Russians are far behind the Americans in the technology related to SDI area.

CHANCELLOR: Senator, if things don't go well here and in the subsequent negotiations in Geneva, and we don't really get an agreement on the terminology of the ABM Treaty and on this weapons, what's down the road for both countries?

NUNN: Well, I hope that even though I don't expect a breakthrough at the summit, I hope we don't have a breakdown and I hope we have modest and useful progress and I think that is the most likely course. But if you anticipate it a complete breakdown of all negotiations, I think you would have an offensive and defensive race and it would be more intense than anything we've seen in the past. I think that would be very grave for the world and I think it would have very severe implications on the economic systems of both countries.

KALB: Senator, you have talked to Gorbachev, you are one of the few senators who has, do you believe that Gorbachev one, understands the very point that you just made, and do you feel that he is ready for some kind of major agreement on arms control at this summit?

NUNN: Well, I think he is ready on an agreement on his terms. He is going to have to change the Soviet proposals considerably. He is going to have to correct the Soviet violations like the radar in Central Siberia. He is going to have to go back to the old definitions of what strategic systems are, he is going to have to change the alcom limitation. He's got to do a lot of changing, but if he does that then we've got to be more flexible also and we've got to have, I think, the kind of timing and sense of timing to take advantage of a considerable opportunity. We have more leverage now than we've had in the past and I think both sides have more mutual interest in serious arms control than in the past.

Guest: Robert McFarlane.

KALB: Earlier today, you expressed optimism and I just want to find out exactly what that expression was aimed at. At certain issues of a bilateral nature between the U.S. and the Soviet Union. I want to be sure that we understand. You are talking about the strong what probability, likelihood of a cultural exchange agreement?

McFARLANE: Marvin, I was referring to President Reagan's feelings of hopefulness and yes optimism for progress across the board.

KALB: But you were talking about bilateral relations, I just want to clear up these specific issues.

McFARLANE: There has been a measure of progress in recent days on bilateral issues.

-more-

MEET THE PRESS (continued)

BROKAW: Mr. McFarlane, there is this continuing flap over Secretary of Defense Weinberger's letter that appeared in both the Washington Post and the New York Times in which he advised the President not to extend the SALT II Treaty beyond Dec. 31st of this year. And he talked about the ABM Treaty, not to make changes in that that would restrict American work on SDI or Star Wars. When a senior administration official was asked if this was an attempt to sabotage the summit, he responded "sure it was" as I understand it. Were you that senior administration official? There has been a lot of speculation about that?

McFARLANE: There's been a lot of inappropriate emphasis and comment on it, I think, Tom. I'm afraid it's typical of you all that you become preoccupied with what is a very transitory issue and miss in the process the historical significance of this meeting. The letter of the report was requested by the President. It is part of many elements that would go into his decisions on our policy with regard to the SALT II Treaty and most importantly, will be his own reaction, I think, to the discussions that he has in Geneva with General Secretary Gorbachev.

BROKAW: But with all due respect, sir, if in fact, a senior administration official said that it was an attempt to sabotage the summit by the Defense Secretary of the United States in a letter that appears in public, without the President's knowledge beforehand, that's not just us making something of it. That represents, it seems to me, very serious conflict within the administration.

McFARLANE: There is absolutely zero conflict on the commitment of the President and every one of his advisors to deep reductions and offensive nuclear weapons, to make progress in the resolution of regional disputes, to expanding cooperation in bilateral areas and to making our case on human rights issues. We are here as a team and there is no one who doesn't feel very strongly in support of the President's positions on every one of those issues.

CHANCELLOR: Mr. McFarlane, let me take you to the substance of negotiations here. Two questions, one is are they negotiations in the real sense of the word or are we doing something at this summit the Americans and the Soviets that hasn't been done at summits before?

McFARLANE: I think we are. If the President is able to persuade Mr. Gorbachev of deep conviction with which he believes right now, there is the opportunity for setting a course for stable peaceful discourse on all of the various disagreements we have that this can be a different kind of summit. It really is 40 years in the making where we've adopted policies for dealing with the Soviet Union that have been based on assumptions that haven't proven out. Now, on the basis of that history and realism, the President is convinced we can make progress and he is right.

MCLAUGHLIN GROUP

MODERATOR: John McLaughlin. PANEL: Jack Germond, Morton Kondracke, Robert Novak, Karen Elliott House of The Wall Street Journal.

On the summit:

MCLAUGHLIN: Doesn't (the President's pre-summit speech) sound like detente revisited...?

HOUSE: I thought the speech was exactly the right tone for going into a summit where they don't really know the tone Gorbachev's going to take in the private meetings and that he has, I think, very successfully lowered people's expectations to what's realistically possible.

NOVAK: That speech turned my stomach, it was so wimpish. But I have a pretty good memory and I remember that Richard Nixon bombed the dickens out of Hanoi, then went to the summit and gave everything away. I think perhaps...that this is a protective device in case Gorbachev is the lout he proved to be in dealing with Shultz, so I would not underestimate the Gipper on this.

GERMOND: ...I thought it was an absolutely perfectly appropriate speech by the President. It's exactly the right thing to say. I don't think it lowers expectations....

KONDRACKE: Everybody knows even the softest person in this Administration is not going back to detente....

MCLAUGHLIN: Want me to give you the detente agenda? You've got a total web of ties -- educational, cultural, scientific and trade barriers, a la Nixon.

Who's going to win the summit? HOUSE: I would bet my money on Ronald Reagan...because I think Reagan has approached the whole thing very realistically. It's going to be a great show, and I don't think a great deal more. NOVAK: Despite the mush from the Gipper on Thursday night, I believe he will not...give in and therefore the winners of the summit will be the people of the free world. GERMOND: If they can get through this summit without an out-and-out shouting match, I think everybody wins. KONDRACKE: I think in a strange way, it's going to be a tie....It seems to me what happens here is that each of them gets out of it what he wants to get out. There's going to be a schedule for another summit and the Europeans will be mildly reassured....

MCLAUGHLIN: Do you see any signs of a sellout here on Ronald Reagan's part? What's going to happen to Reagan's core constituency?

KONDRACKE: John, you were not listening to his speech. In the first two speeches he was talking about the Soviet government....In the second, he was talking about the Russian people who died by the millions, and that was a radio broadcast to the Soviet Union. Ronald Reagan has always had a two-part approach to the Soviet Union. One, hardline anti-communist; another, the man who said that if the Soviets would only come over here and fly in a helicopter over Los Angeles they would see what kind of people we are....

MCLAUGHLIN GROUP (continued)

NOVAK (recounting how the President was given a Darth Vader doll): ...The President laughed and he says, "I still think they're the evil empire." And that's what he really thinks. There has been no change in Ronald Reagan.

HOUSE: I agree with Bob entirely....

GERMOND: ...I think it is a mistake to think that Ronald Reagan's core constituency are the full-mooners on the far right who expect him to go in there and demand all sorts of human rights concessions. I think his core constituency is the blue collar constituency and the moderate conservatives in this country, and I think Reagan will satisfy them....

On the Pentagon vs. the State Department on arms control:

MCLAUGHLIN: Is this battle effectively over because it's clear who the winners are, i.e. Shultz and Nitze against the hardliners, Weinberger, who's not even going to the summit?

HOUSE: Much too much is being made out of Weinberger not going. None of Richard Nixon's defense secretaries, as I recall, ever went to a summit....Weinberger doesn't need to go. He's the man closest, I believe, to Reagan's views, so Reagan is representing Weinberger at the summit.

GERMOND: ...I can't imagine going to the summit and not having the Secretary of Defense in the next room as a consulting resource during those meetings.

NOVAK: ...I think the argument that Nixon did not have his secretary of defense there was a problem. They gave away the store at Moscow....

KONDRACKE: ...If the Soviets come up with an offer that would tempt this government to give up development and deployment of star wars, you will see Battle Royal....

On Gramm-Rudman:

NOVAK: ...The problem is that there is no way you can have anything passing both houses of Congress on deficit reduction and still have in the future years 3% defense growth. The White House has got to make up their mind whether they're going to veto their own creature or they're going to take a big cut in defense. They haven't made up their mind....

KONDRACKE: They are making progress, they report, in the conference now, and maybe while Reagan's off at the summit they will come up with (an agreement)....

GERMOND: The White House grabbed Gramm-Rudman, (saying) "Oh isn't this marvelous?" Then they read the fine print.

AGRONSKY & COMPANY

Moderator: Martin Agronsky. Panel: Elizabeth Drew, Jack Kilpatrick, Carl Rowan, Hugh Sidey. Strobe Talbott reports from Moscow.

On the summit:

STROBE TALBOTT reports from Moscow that expectations there for a breakthrough at the summit could hardly be lower. It's as though Washington and Moscow were each trying to outdo the other in pessimism about the summit.

AGRONSKY: Do you share that kind of pessimism?

ROWAN: In 25 years in this town, I have never seen before a summit so much disarray, so many contradictions in the highest levels of government. I don't expect an awful lot.

KILPATRICK: ...I've been pessimistic all along and I still am.

SIDEY: I'm not pessimistic. It depends on your definition, but it seems to me an agreement to meet again is some satisfactory result. If these fellows are meeting, presumably they will not be doing other things that are worse like going to war.

DREW: ...I think the only real question is whether or not the Soviet leaders and Mr. Reagan will want to, for their own reasons, try to find a way to finesse their fundamental disagreement on SDI, which I don't think will be worked out by them. And what kind of summit they want to come out with. But I never thought it would be very much...

AGRONSKY: I join not in pessimism, but in rather small expectations.

TALBOTT reports from Moscow on the SDI disagreement: The impression I've gotten here in Moscow this week is that there is kind of an Alfonse and Gastone act going on between the superpowers. Each one is waiting for the other to show some sign of flexibility on this whole issue of space and defense. And a number of Soviets have told me if President Reagan would tell Mr. Gorbachev that the U.S. might after all be willing to negotiate seriously on some restrictions on the Star Wars program, the Soviet Union might be more reasonable in permitting research.

ROWAN: They aren't going to get it (SDI flexibility) if the Defense Secretary knows what he's talking about....He says SDI isn't even going to be an issue....Remember this is a meeting to which the Defense Secretary isn't even going. Can you imagine anybody coming up with an arms agreement or any kind of agreement on SDI when Weinberger isn't there...? It was extraordinary and I don't understand all these contradictory wrinkles.

AGRONSKY: I don't think Weinberger being there matters all that much. By and large, defense secretaries do not attend summit meetings....

AGRONSKY & COMPANY (continued)

SIDEY: Why do we always put the monkey on President Reagan's back in this matter? Why isn't it just as important that Mr. Gorbachev come in and say, "We will accept certain research or something, yield a little on star wars, if you indeed will curtail it or restrain it"?

KILPATRICK: Last time I had lunch with Cap Weinberger, which was a couple months ago, he was talking about the research that the Soviets are doing in this identical field. Nothing has been said about getting them to stop their research.

DREW: ...There have been divisive reports within our own Administration of Paul Nitze, who is very involved in this, has said yes, he sees the possibility that there could come out of the summit guidelines for future arms control talks. Others have said that isn't the case....That is very unusual....But star wars is the centerpiece, and the old question is, as I've said before, is whether each side wants to find a way temporarily to finesse their disagreement so that it looks like there's progress, but there isn't going to be much progress.

On the President's pre-summit speech:

AGRONSKY: ...The most interesting part of the speech, in a sense, was that he did not relate to arms control -- which is what he's going to Geneva, presumably, to undertake.

DREW: He made some mention of arms control....But his emphasis, you're exactly right, was on cultural exchanges....But a lot of this is reversion to what has gone on before. We have a lot of these cultural exchanges. They were halted after the Soviet invasion of Afghanistan and those agreements were allowed to lapse during the Reagan Administration. He didn't feel that it was right to resume them because of Poland, because the Soviets were cheating on arms control, because of Nicaragua or what have you. So it looks to me as if they are reaching for something to be sure that they can say comes out of the summit....

ROWAN: The business about Sesame Street and so forth sounds silly. But there are some interesting little things there. The airlines agreement. We stopped that because we caught them spying on our submarine facilities in Connecticut....It'll be interesting to see if Mr. Reagan gives them the right to fly back in.

SIDEY: I have a theory that summits do not fail. I think they're useful no matter what....This is a useful exercise...

AGRONSKY: Do you regard it as useful that the President persist in this sort of romantic approach, which I applaud in a way, of trying to say that what matters more than anything else is that our children have an opportunity to grow up, that we have world peace?

KILPATRICK: I thought it was an eloquent speech the President made the other night. Conciliatory in its tone; it had enough of the hard line there to satisfy the right wing. But Hugh, you're exactly right on this. If they would simply get together...feel each other out...develop these cultural things...but anyone who thinks there's going to be an arms control agreement coming out of this is crazy.... END