

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: 04/20/1987

Box: 395

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

MONDAY, APRIL 20, 1987 -- 6 a.m. EDT EDITION

TODAY'S HEADLINES

INTERNATIONAL NEWS

REAGAN SET TO DEAL WITH ARMS, TRADE -- President Reagan returns to the White House to lobby for an arms pact with the Soviets and a trade settlement with the Japanese.
(Baltimore Sun, USA Today, Washington Times)

NEGOTIATORS ON BOTH SIDES WARN THAT PITFALLS REMAIN -- American and Soviet arms control experts warned of pitfalls before a superpower weapons agreement is signed, despite growing optimism by the leaders of both countries.
(Washington Times, AP, Reuter, UPI)

U.S. SANCTIONS ON JAPANESE GOODS WILL STAY IN PLACE, YEUTTER -- U.S. trade sanctions against Japan, announced last Friday, will stay in place for the time being, U.S. Trade Representative Clayton Yeutter said.
(Wall Street Journal, Reuter)

NETWORK NEWS (Sunday Evening)

ARMS CONTROL -- U.S. and Soviet officials expressed cautious optimism about chances for an agreement to eliminate nuclear missiles in Europe.

IRAN-CONTRA -- Attorney General Meese said he didn't ask CIA director Casey about the diversion of money to the contras from the sale of U.S. weapons to Iran.

INTERNATIONAL NEWS...A-2

NATIONAL NEWS.....A-9

IRAN-NICARAGUA.....A-10

NETWORK NEWS.....B-1

SUNDAY TALK SHOWS....C-1

INTERNATIONAL NEWS

ARMS CONTROL, TRADE PUT REAGAN 'BACK ON THE OFFENSIVE'

Predictions of a Reagan presidency permanently crippled by the Iran-contra affair may have been premature.

An American version of "glasnost," or openness, has replaced the secrecy and paranoia in the White House just two months ago.

Moreover, arms control, trade and battles with Congress over domestic spending have helped President Reagan project a take-charge image that has diverted much of the nation's attention from the Iran-contra episode.

The President is "back on the offensive," said Chief of Staff Howard Baker's longtime aide, James Cannon.

(Jeremiah O'Leary & Willis Witter, Washington Times, A1)

Reagan Set To Deal With Arms, Trade

President Reagan returns to the White House to lobby for an arms pact with the Soviets and a trade settlement with the Japanese.

The Administration hopes Reagan can continue to set the agenda -- keeping his distance from the Iran-contra scandal, the subject of congressional hearings starting May 4.

Reagan, after a 10-day vacation at his Santa Barbara ranch, faces a busy schedule:

- Making progress toward arms control, the centerpiece for a superpowers summit. Though Reagan hasn't embraced the Soviet plan, he's called it "the right direction." He meets this week with congressional leaders on the Soviet proposal to ban medium-range weapons in Europe and provide inspection at superpower nuclear test sites.
- Walking a trade tightrope. Japanese Foreign Minister Shintaro Abe is in Washington for talks with officials on Reagan's raising \$300 million in tariffs against Japanese computers, power tools and TV sets in retaliation for Japan's closed market. Reagan is expected to use the trade war to ward off Congress' protectionist mood.

(Johanna Neuman, USA Today, A1)

Broader Issues Stressed As Reagan Returns

SANTA BARBARA -- President Reagan returns to Washington after a 10-day Easter vacation facing trade and budget battles with Congress and holding our fresh hope that an arms control agreement with the Soviet Union is within reach.

Armed with fresh strategies for foreign and domestic policy, the White House aims to "shape" a broad political agenda as Reagan tries to recover from the Iran-contra scandal.

"Part of what the planning phase is looking at are the issues we'll be facing...and you look at them in a broader context," said a senior White House official who was involved in daily strategy sessions at this seaside resort town.

These brain-storming sessions, which have included a longtime Reagan consultant, Stewart Spencer, and the Republican pollster Richard Wirthlin, have addressed such issues as budget reform, trade, arms control and the Administration's approach to AIDS.

(Julie Johnson, Baltimore Sun, A1)

U.S. NEGOTIATOR WARY ON ARMS DEAL

A senior U.S. arms negotiator adopted a more cautious attitude toward a superpower arms agreement than that demonstrated recently by President Reagan and other American officials.

"We don't have an agreement until the details are nailed down," said Paul Nitze, who was in Moscow last week with Secretary Shultz, on ABC's "This Week With David Brinkley."

A Soviet arms negotiator, Viktor Karpov, said on the same program the Soviet Union was willing to negotiate reductions in conventional, non-nuclear forces as well as lower the numbers of nuclear weapons in Europe.

"In this process we are ready to negotiate the redresses on any imbalances that are there or might be here in conventional forces," Karpov said. Karpov said it was "a clearcut position of our country" that the Soviet Union was willing to negotiate lower levels of conventional forces in Europe, a point made less directly by Soviet leader Gorbachev in a speech in Prague earlier this month. (Reuter)

Soviet, American Officials Cautious On Arms Control

Soviet and American officials are warning that although there has been dramatic progress in the search for an arms control agreement, last-minute problems could endanger the disarmament process.

Despite those notes of caution, expressed on two television programs Sunday, one Soviet official said he believed that at last week's visit to Moscow by Secretary Shultz, groundwork was laid for a summit meeting this year between President Reagan and Soviet leader Gorbachev.

"We suggested to Mr. Shultz, in fact, an exact deal that would lead to the meeting of Mr. President with our general secretary, in the autumn or at the end of the year," Viktor Karpov, the chief Soviet arms control official, said on ABC's "This Week With David Brinkley."

On NBC's "Meet the Press," Richard Perle, the assistant defense secretary who oversees Pentagon arms control matters, expressed similar guarded optimism.

"I would think the chances are quite good for a summit...provided we settle the issue of verification, and provided we get a satisfactory solution to the short-range missile problem," Perle said. He said that as negotiators come closer to solutions, they have to be very careful because "the details can go horribly wrong." (Alan Fram, AP)

Negotiators On Both Sides Warn That Pitfalls Remain

American and Soviet arms control experts warned of pitfalls before a superpower weapons agreement is signed, despite growing optimism by the leaders of both countries.

Assistant Defense Secretary Richard Perle, who accompanied Secretary Shultz to Moscow, cautioned that the Soviets will not discuss a reduction in strategic nuclear weapons and still want the U.S. to abandon SDI.

Another trouble spot, Perle said on NBC's "Meet the Press," is whether the Soviet Union will accept U.S. proposals to verify compliance with any arms control agreement.

"This isn't the millennium," Perle said. "The Soviets are not laying down their arms. Peace isn't going to break out."

Soviet spokesman Georgi Arbatov, also appearing on NBC, accused Perle of being the "principle monkeywrench-thrower in the arms control machine."

Arbatov, like Perle, was cautious about predicting an arms control agreement.
(Mary Belcher, Washington Times, A5)

Experts Warn Of Pitfalls To Arms Agreement

The House Armed Services Committee chairman, joining other U.S. and Soviet experts in warning of pitfalls to a superpower arms control agreement, says the pact being negotiated now "is a little bit dangerous" -- an indication that President Reagan's optimism may not be shared on Capitol Hill.

Rep. Les Aspin said the pact being worked out "worries me a very, very great deal. I think that this business of gradually eliminating sections of nuclear weapons is not a very smart idea, given the fact that as long as there's a conventional (forces) imbalance in Europe we're going to need nuclear weapons."

"It's a process there that I think is a little bit dangerous," said the former Pentagon analyst, indicating potential opposition in Congress. "We're eliminating the safest weapons and leaving in the most dangerous."

(Henry David Rosso, UPI)

Europeans Wary Of Missile Removal

PARIS -- Europeans are increasingly wary of Soviet General Secretary Gorbachev's offer to remove all Euromissiles, and French defense experts say a deal could prove to be a trap.

Caution is being expressed in Britain, West Germany and at NATO headquarters in Brussels.

French Foreign Minister Jean-Bernard Raimond has warned repeatedly that denuclearizing Western Europe would leave it exposed to the Soviet alliance's 3-to-1 advantage in conventional armed forces.

(Tom Nuzum, Washington Times, A7)

ADELMAN WANTS U.S.-SOVIET ARMS PACT IN SINGLE PACKAGE Deal Would Be Designed To Allay European Fears

U.S. officials have several potential responses to Moscow's latest arms control offer, including one allowing the superpowers to retain some short-range missiles in Europe, according to the director of the U.S. Arms Control and Disarmament Agency.

"The big considerations are, can you have a good INF deal without adding fuel to the bad idea of the denuclearization of Western Europe?" Adelman said. "And the answer, I think, is yes."

Adelman and other senior officials said the U.S. would now like to wrap all the issues into a single treaty, ending years of often divisive debate with U.S. allies over nuclear weapons in Europe.

(Warren Strobel & James Dorsey, Washington Times, A5)

DEMOCRATS PLAN ACTION ON ARMS CONTROL MEASURES

Democratic leaders, back from arms control discussions in Moscow, plan House action this week on nuclear amendments designed to push President Reagan toward an accord with the Soviets.

But the Administration is threatening to veto the action, not only because it doesn't want restrictions put on its arms talks but also because Reagan considers the underlying legislation a budget buster.

With U.S.-Soviet discussions also in high gear, the House Appropriations Committee has added a pair of nuclear arms amendments to an \$11 billion spending package scheduled for House action on Wednesday or Thursday.

The bill would eliminate almost all tests of U.S. nuclear weapons. The Democrats also would require the U.S. to comply with the unratified SALT II nuclear arms control treaty.

(Steven Komarow, AP)

SOVIETS FIRE BACK ON RIGHTS Kremlin Says U.S. Has Own Problems

MOSCOW -- The Soviet Union escalated its human rights counteroffensive in meetings with U.S. officials here last week, responding to charges of Soviet human rights abuses with accusations that the United States harbors criminals and has its own problems with racism, sexism and poverty.

One senior American diplomat called the Soviet tactic "nonsense," and "cynical." Other U.S. officials here said they have conceded that the U.S. has had to work to improve its civil rights record, but told Soviet leaders that such tactical responses to widespread concerns in the West about Soviet human rights abuses will not gain them any points.

In meetings with Central Committee Secretary Anatoliy Dobrynin and other Soviet officials, Rep. Steny Hoyer said he stressed that the West views a serious Soviet approach toward human rights offenses as a "litmus test" for the credibility of Soviet democratization and economic reform.

(Gary Lee, Washington Post, A17)

WRIGHT, SOVIET SAY GORBACHEV MISINTERPRETED

U.S. and Soviet officials denied that Soviet leader Gorbachev seriously suggested to visiting American legislators that the U.S. set up special areas for blacks and other minorities.

"He's not foolish," commented House Speaker Jim Wright, one of the congressmen who was in Moscow last week, on NBC's "Meet the Press." "He was talking in terms of what they are trying to do in order to create more integrity for their ethnic minorities in their country."

(Reuter story, Washington Post, A22)

'PINSTRIPES' MAY BE NEXT IN EMBASSY SPY PROBE

Foreign Service officers and civilians at the U.S. Embassy in Moscow probably knew of illegal Marine fraternization with Soviet women and may become the subject of a separate investigation into the sex-for-secrets scandal, say senior Administration officials.

Responsibility for the scandal stretches far beyond the Marine Corps, according to the officials and an internal memorandum endorsed by Marine Corps commandant, Gen. Paul X. Kelley.

U.S. officials do not exclude the possibility that U.S. diplomats may have themselves engaged in illegal fraternization with Soviet nationals.

(James Dorsey, Washington Times, A1)

U.S. SANCTIONS ON JAPANESE GOODS WILL STAY IN PLACE, YEUTTER

TOKYO -- U.S. trade sanctions against Japan, announced last Friday, will stay in place for the time being, U.S. Trade Representative Clayton Yeutter said.

Asked whether the sanctions would continue following Japanese requests they be removed, Yeutter told Reuters: "Oh sure. We've told them that over and over already. If they have questions about them, then we will be prepared to answer."

Yeutter's comments appeared to undermine hopes that special Japanese envoy Shintaro Abe, in Washington to ask for early removal of the sanctions, will be successful.

(Greg McCune, Reuter)

Trade Sanctions Expected To Last At Least To June

The stiff tariffs President Reagan imposed on certain Japanese electronic consumer goods are likely to remain in effect until at least mid-June and maybe longer, according to U.S. officials.

As a practical matter, it will take at least two months for the U.S. to obtain new statistical information on Japanese semiconductor sales. "We just can't phony up the figures," said a senior trade negotiator. "And as for dumping, it just has to stop."

(Eduardo Lachica & Ellen Hume, Wall Street Journal, A3)

JAPANESE WARNED ON TRADE
House Leader Sees Tough Sanctions Bill

OISO, Japan -- The House of Representatives will pass a trade bill containing the highly controversial Gephardt amendment mandating punitive action against Japan and other countries with large trade surpluses, House Majority Leader Thomas Foley predicted.

Foley's comments shocked Japanese officials here, who already were upset by President Reagan's imposition of stiff tariffs on certain Japanese imports in response to alleged dumping of semiconductors by Japan.

Sen. Jay Rockefeller added that the mood in the Senate is drifting toward tougher legislation likely to include language similar to the Gephardt amendment.

Foley said that the Reagan Administration was misjudging the situation in Congress, placing undue faith in the prospect that the trade bill passed by the Ways and Means Committee without the Gephardt provision would prevail.

(Hobart Rowen, Washington Post, A17)

ARGENTINA EXPLODES WITH JOY AS ARMY REBELLION ENDS

BUENOS AIRES -- Hundreds of thousands of Argentines singing their national anthem greeted word from President Raul Alfonsin that a four-day army rebellion had ended with the peaceful surrender of the rebels.

Alfonsin, 61, made his announcement last night before an estimated 400,000 people outside Government House in Buenos Aires. He had returned from a meeting with rebel leader Lt. Col. Aldo Rico at the Campo de Mayo army base on the outskirts of the capital.

The rebel army officers, meanwhile, celebrated their surrender as a victory.

"We believe the president and the leaders of the main political parties have understood that this can be the starting point for the reconciliation of all Argentines," Rico said.

A message of support for Alfonsin was received from President Reagan. Reagan's message, released by a White House Spokesman in Santa Barbara, Calif., where the President was spending Easter, said the U.S. had "supported Argentine democracy since its restoration in 1983 and we strongly reaffirm our support of President Alfonsin and the continued rule of law in Argentina."

(Stewart Russell, Reuter)

Argentina's President Wins Rebel Surrender

BUENOS AIRES -- President Raul Alfonsin, pulling Argentina back from the brink of bloodshed, personally confronted Army rebels at an infantry school they were holding and accepted their surrender.

The presidential action appeared to reaffirm civilian rule in a country rocked by half a century of military coups. Commentators praised the peaceful outcome as an encouraging sign of the consolidation of democracy. But amid the euphoria of the moment, serious questions lingered about the future ability of Army commanders to enforce discipline among lower-ranking officers who had refused to move against the rebels.

(Bradley Graham, Washington Post, A1)

PLO SQUAD IS CRUSHED INSIDE ISRAEL

KIRYAT SHEMONA, Israel -- Israeli soldiers clashed with a heavily armed Palestinian unit on a hostage-taking mission inside Israel's northern border, leaving the three guerrillas and two soldiers dead, the Israeli Army and radio reported.

It was the first attempted infiltration of the area by Palestinian guerrillas in more than a year and the first time since before Israel's 1982 invasion of Lebanon that guerrillas succeeded in penetrating Israel's northern border, scene of numerous bloody operations in the 1970s.

(Glenn Frankel, Washington Post, A1)

Israeli Helicopters Raid Lebanon After Guerrilla Infiltration

JERUSALEM -- Israeli helicopter gunships attacked South Lebanon after two Israeli soldiers died in a clash with three Palestinian guerrilla infiltrators seeking to take hostages in northern Israel, the army said.

The infiltrators carried leaflets that said they were sent by the Fatah faction of the PLO to seize hostages to exchange for Palestinians in Israeli jails, the army said.

(Galina Vromen, Reuter)

NATIONAL NEWS

REAGAN RETURNS TO WASHINGTON TODAY

SANTA BARBARA -- President Reagan, ending a nine-day vacation in the Santa Ynez Mountains, returns to Washington trying to keep up momentum for an arms control agreement but sure to butt heads with Congress on the budget.

After a retreat interrupted repeatedly by developments in the U.S.-Soviet arena, Reagan is aware that Democrats intend to press hard on the budget in the weeks ahead. His radio address during the weekend focused on arms control, but the Democratic response for the third straight week dealt with the budget.

The President and the First Lady were due back in Washington late Monday after an unusually high-profile retreat that his new staff used to plot a course for the final 21 months of his presidency.

The Reagans, who savor the privacy of their mountain home, had reporters to the ranch Thursday for a visit by Secretary Shultz, ventured down the road Saturday to a camp for young cancer patients and marked Easter Sunday with a surprise trip to the First Presbyterian Church in Santa Barbara.

(Norman Sandler, UPI)

FOREIGNERS GET U.S. FARM SUBSIDIES

GAO Says Overseas Investors

Collected \$7.7 Million in 1985

Investors from West Germany and the Netherlands Antilles received more than \$3 million in American farm program subsidies in 1985 through ownership of U.S. farmland, according to a General Accounting Office study.

The GAO study of 401 U.S. counties where the bulk of foreign-owned farmland is located found that 598 foreign owners received \$7.7 million of the subsidies intended to support U.S. farmers' income and offset losses caused by surplus-crop reduction programs.

Almost half the 598 owners were corporations, suggesting that the Agriculture Department subsidies provided incentives for investing in American farmland. Twenty-one foreign-owned corporations received payments of at least \$50,000 each, while one in Sherman County, Oregon, was paid \$71,680.

(Ward Sinclair, Washington Post, A13)

IRAN-NICARAGUA

A SACRIFICED ADVANTAGE

Whatever else the Iran-contra scandal may have done, it has usefully put to rest the once-widespread belief that President Reagan was exempt from the laws of political gravity.

In Washington, the notion of Reagan invulnerability blossomed into the Teflon theory, so-called because nothing was supposed to stick to him. Teflon had a catchy ring and a Reaganesque quality of sounding significant while explaining nothing.

The voters are not boobs, despite the temptation of defeated politicians to see them in this light. Polls taken for the White House showed widespread recognition that Reagan was often distanced and ill-informed. However, many voters valued peace and prosperity more than a display of knowledge at a news conference. When the Iran-contra disclosures made Americans realize that the price for presidential disengagement was higher than they had recognized, many changed their minds.

Now, after all the explanations, two of three Americans tell the pollsters they do not believe Reagan's repeated assertion that he knew nothing about the diversion of Iran arms sales proceeds to the contras. To the majority of Americans, the President has become just another disbelieved politician. And the Teflon theory, never much to begin with, has perished along with Reagan's credibility.

(Lou Cannon, Washington Post, A2)

NOTORIOUS SYRIAN TIED TO NORTH Arms For Contras Bought Through Suspected Terrorist

Marine Lt. Col. Oliver North's private arms network purchased 158 tons of assault rifles and ammunition for the Nicaraguan rebels last year from a reputed international narcotics smuggler and terrorist linked to the Achille Lauro hijackers.

Sources familiar with the sale identified the arms dealer as Manzer al-Kassar, a 42-year-old Syrian who reportedly has supplied arms to Mohammed Abul Abbas -- head of the Palestine Liberation Front and reputed mastermind of the 1985 Achille Lauro hijacking in the Mediterranean -- and to other radical Palestinian groups.

The arms were purchased by a company linked to retired Air Force Maj. Gen. Richard Secord and his business associate, Albert Hakim. Both men have figured prominently in the Iran-contra scandal.

The purchase of the arms from al-Kassar was confirmed by congressional investigators.

(Newsday story, Baltimore Sun, A1)

NETWORK NEWS SUMMARY FOR SUNDAY, APRIL 19, 1987

ARMS CONTROL

ABC's SAM DONALDSON: Reagan Administration officials are continuing their optimistic talk about chances for a new arms control agreement with the Soviets. But there were some words of caution and even outright opposition voiced today as well.

JEANNE MESERVE: Appearing on "This Week With David Brinkley," Arms Advisor Paul Nitze pointed to the progress already made on arms control. An agreement between the U.S. and the Soviet Union to conduct nuclear tests on each other's territory.

(NITZE: "Yes, we will accept that. That (when) is being worked out. It hasn't been decided exactly.")

The exchange is intended to improve verification methods for nuclear testing. Verification remains one of the obstacles to an agreement on removing medium-range nuclear missiles from Europe. But, it's not the only one. If the super powers agree to keep 100 intermediate-range warheads apiece, the U.S. wants the freedom to put theirs in Alaska -- right next door to the Soviet Union.

(NITZE: "It's important for us not to give up the right to have them in Alaska. And we have not.")

But will the Soviets object to that?

(VIKTOR KARPOV: "Yes - sure. You see the situation now is that no medium-range missiles of the Soviet Union are deployed in a way to reach the U.S. territory, even Alaska.")

Administration negotiators today tried to dampen expectations that the issues blocking a medium-range accord will be easily resolved.

(RICHARD PERLE, Assistant Secretary of Defense: "Until the black and white is there and the "i"s are dotted and the "t"s crossed, you can't be sure that you've concluded a successful agreement.")

The head of the House Armed Services Committee said today that he, like the European allies, is worried not just about the specific terms of a medium-range accord, but it's total affect.

(REP. LES ASPIN: "I think that this business of gradually eliminating sections of nuclear weapons is not a very smart ideal, given the fact that as long as there's the conventional imbalance in Europe, we're going to need nuclear weapons.")

But Paul Nitze said today he does not think European sentiment will block an arms deal. And both American and Soviet participants in the negotiations continue to express optimism that there will be an arms accord and a summit this year.

DONALDSON: NATO commander General Bernard Rogers, whose replacement has already been announced, has denounced the prospective agreement to Newsweek, saying such a pact would make Western Europe safe for conventional war and that Moscow might one day use it's superior conventional force to intimidate, coerce and blackmail European nations.

(ABC-5)

CBS's SUE SPENCER: Prospects for a U.S./Soviet arms deal is certainly better now than when (the President) left Washington 10 days ago.

CBS's JACQUELINE ADAMS: There are signs that the President and his advisors have deliberately begun to temper their public optimism that an agreement to eliminate intermediate-range missiles in Europe is imminent. Despite the progress they made last week in Moscow, two of the President's arms controls experts warn that difficult issues remain.

(PAUL NITZE: "We don't have an agreement until everything is agreed, until the last commas are agreed to.")

(RICHARD PERLE: "This isn't the millennium. The Soviets have not laying down their arms, peace isn't going to break out.")

Sources say Administration officials believe they may have mishandled the public relations of last week's talks, but being openly optimistic too early and by letting Soviet leader Gorbachev take the credit for what originally was a Ronald Reagan proposal to eliminate Euro-missiles. Even today the Soviets tried to sound as if they were in the driver's seat.

(GEORGI ARBATOV: "I would say there was never such a chance given to any President of the United States as now, to have really important steps in Soviet/American relations.")

By the end of May, Administration officials hope to present a detailed allied response to the Soviets. In the meantime, sources say the Reagan team plans are cautious while plotting the President's arms control public relations counteroffensive. (CBS-8)

NBC's CONNIE CHUNG: U.S. and Soviet officials expressed cautious optimism today about chances for an agreement to eliminate nuclear missiles in Europe. President Reagan is ready to push for approval of a deal.

ROBIN LLOYD: Top officials say the latest Soviet proposals brought back from Moscow by Secretary of State Shultz will be at the top of the President's agenda when he return to Washington tomorrow. They say he intends to contact allied leaders personally to try to persuade them to go along with eliminating most if not all medium and short-range missiles in Europe. Some European leaders are worried that this would make them more vulnerable to a Soviet attack. But Administration officials disagree.

(RICHARD PERLE: "What is accomplished is the elimination of 1400 warheads on Soviet SS 20s in exchange for which the U.S. would be giving up a little over 300 warheads of comparable systems. So that part of the agreement is a very good outcome for the United States.")

But ABC's "This Week" the President's special advisor on arms control, Ambassador Paul Nitze, said no decision will be made until this is discussed with the allies.

(NITZE: "We've got to have serious consultation with them about it.")

But already, four days after Shultz ended his talks with the Soviets, the U.S. position is becoming increasingly clear. Medium-range and short-range missiles would be eliminated from Europe, but smaller, tactical battlefield nuclear weapons wouldn't be effected. The U.S. has some 4,000 of these weapons now in Europe and top officials say they want no limits placed on them. That drew criticism from Democratic Congressman Les Aspin.

(ASPIN: "We've taking out the safest missiles and leaving in the most dangerous.")

But other key Democrats have been optimistic about the prospects of an arms control agreement. And a Soviet spokesman today appeared to agree.

NBC's Lloyd continues:

(GEORGI ARBATOV: "I would say there was never such a chance given to any President of the U.S. as now.")

White House officials say they expect the President will decide within the next few weeks to largely accept the Soviet proposals to eliminate medium and short-range missiles in Europe. But they emphasize this could change if the European allies express strong objections.

CHUNG: The Soviet Union conducted two underground nuclear tests today, raising the total to six since ending a self-imposed testing freeze in February. Both devices have the force of 20,000 tons of dynamite.

(NBC-4)

IRAN-CONTRA

DONALDSON: There was an echo from the Iran arms sales story today. Attorney General Edwin Meese has told the Washington Post he didn't ask CIA Director William Casey about the diversion of money to the contra rebels from the sale of U.S. arms to Iran, even though he had the chance, because he said it would have been inappropriate. Meese said a few hours after he read the memo disclosing such diversion, he dropped by Casey's home for a beer and chat, but didn't bring up the subject, because he said Casey wouldn't have known anything about that.

(ABC-4, NBC-10)

ARGENTINA

DONALDSON: A small but potentially dangerous military revolt against the civilian government appears to have ended, put down in dramatic fashion by the President himself. The President went to the rebel camp, confronted their leader and secured their surrender and arrest....

(ABC-Lead, ABC-Lead, NBC-8)

SOUTH KOREA

CHUNG: In Seoul, South Korea, anti-government protest turned rough today when a huge force of riot police tried to control demonstrators who had spilled onto the city streets. The thousands of protesters had gathered to mark the anniversary of a bloody student uprising in 1960....

(NBC-Lead, ABC-3)

TERRORISTS IN ISRAEL

SPENCER: A bloody Sunday it was in the Holy Land. At least two Israeli soldiers and three Palestinian guerrillas were killed in a violent border clash. The Israelis then retaliated with an air raid near the Palestinian refugee camp. The Israelis say it all started when guerrilla crossed the security zone near an isolated border community planning, they say, to kidnap civilian hostages. Israeli soldiers spotted the guerrillas and opened fired, killing the infiltrators and losing two of their own. Later Israeli helicopter gunships rockets a suspected guerrilla hideout, two people were wounded....

(CBS-2, ABC-2, NBC-2)

KOREAN TRADE

DONALDSON: Commerce Secretary Malcolm Baldrige warned South Korea today it must open its markets to American goods or risk the same kind of stiff tariffs on its own exports to the U.S. that Washington has now imposed on some products from Japan. Baldrige spoke at a luncheon in the Korean capitol in Seoul.... (ABC-7)

WATER & POWER

CHUNG: The Reagan Administration had a chance this past week to cut the federal budget by about \$70 million a year, by ending water subsidies to some big corporate farms in the West. Instead, it allowed a loophole to keep the money flowing.... (NBC-11)

SERVICES TO ABUSED CHILDREN

SPENCER: A House Committee report out tonight charges that the Reagan Administration has illegally denied service to abused children, by, it says, withholding millions of dollars in Congressional approved aid. Committee Republicans disagreed with the report's conclusions which says that programs for child abuse prevention, latchkey children and teenagers, all were denied funds.... (CBS-10)

REAGAN'S EASTER

DONALDSON: President and Mrs. Reagan attended regular morning services at the First Presbyterian church in Santa Barbara -- the second Easter in a row the President has attended church.
(TV coverage: The President and Mrs. Reagan leaving church)
(ABC-10, CBS-8, NBC-4)

THIS WEEK WITH DAVID BRINKLEY

MODERATOR: David Brinkley. PANEL: George Will, Sam Donaldson, Bob Maynard

GUESTS: Paul Nitze, Presidential Adviser on Arms Control; Viktor Karpov, Soviet Arms Control Authority, and Rep. Les Aspin.

BRINKLEY: Mr. Aspin...tell us what you've learned.

ASPIN: The line is...here's a chance to deal.... They want us to go back and kind of help put pressure on the Administration to move the whole thing along.

BRINKLEY: You going to do that?

ASPIN: Some of (the delegation) think its a good idea, other think it's not.

BRINKLEY: What do you think?

ASPIN: I'm worried about it.... This business of gradually eliminating sections of nuclear weapons is not a very smart idea, given the conventional imbalance in Europe.... I think what we've doing in this whole process is that we're eliminating the safest weapons and leaving the most dangerous....

WILL: Does the Administration accept the fact that we need nuclear weapons in Europe?

ASPIN: I don't know.

WILL: What would happen to the defense budget were we to have what the President says he wants...?

ASPIN: In order of magnitude...we would need another 10 divisions on our side...it's big bucks.

DONALDSON: Now it appears he (the President) is serious about arms control and you don't like it.

ASPIN: The problem is this Administration is totally schizophrenic about arms control....

DONALDSON: Will the Democrats continue to press this package that you started last fall or is it a dead issue?

ASPIN: I think they will.

GUEST: Ambassador Karpov

KARPOV: The prospect of resolving the security in Europe, I cannot accept because of that accent he (Aspin) made on the necessity to redress the balance in conventional forces before we even start to to speak about reduction or even elimination of nuclear weapons in Europe....

-more-

THIS WEEK WITH DAVID BRINKLEY (continued)

WILL: Is it the Soviet position that as an ultimate goal, Europe should be denuclearized and the Soviet Union should retain its enormous conventional and chemical force imbalance?

KARPOV: Yes, we are ready to negotiate every aspect of the problems you raised. Now we are ready to negotiate the elimination of medium-range missiles in Europe. Then we are ready to negotiate the reductions in conventional forces, together with the reductions in tactical weapons.... So there is no problem for us.... So the problem is to start. We are trying to convince the NATO countries almost a year now, reductions of these forces....

DONALDSON: Is it correct that you are willing to negotiate total elimination of the intermediate-range missiles, not preserving the 100 on each side?

KARPOV: That's another problem. We are ready to negotiate elimination of all medium forces as a final go. But we took into consideration other balances...

DONALDSON: Do you think the President wants to reach an agreement?

KARPOV: I think there is a possibility now to reach an agreement, if there is real willingness to do so without artificial obstacles.... I cannot say for the President. I can say for our side. Our side is ready for an agreement this year as well.

GUEST: Ambassador Nitze

BRINKLEY: You have been negotiating arms control reductions with the Soviet Union more or less forever -- what's the difference this time? What has happened over there?

NITZE: It isn't that different....

BRINKLEY: Do you know exactly what the Soviets have offered? The ambassador was not willing or able to tell us.

NITZE: They haven't really offered. They're accepting an offer of ours. After all, it was the President's offer way back in '69.

DONALDSON: What are they accepting?

NITZE: The elimination of what we call LRINF, long-range INF missiles from Europe on both sides. They're going down in Europe to zero. They're accepting an offer that in the rest of the world there will be 100 warheads in Asia, and 100 warheads in the U.S.

DONALDSON: What about short-range missiles?

NITZE: There Mr. Shultz insisted that a solution to the problem would require that the levels be equal on both sides, and we've prepared to go to zero if they are prepared to go to equal level globally.

THIS WEEK WITH DAVID BRINKLEY (continued)

DONALDSON: What did they say?

NITZE: Mr. Gorbachev said yes. But Mr. Shultz made it clear... we would want to consult with our allies.

WILL: Is it not important...for us to insist that if indeed our 100 are to be in the U.S., that they be in Alaska?

NITZE: It's important for us not to give up the right to have them in Alaska, and we have not.

DONALDSON: The Soviets are now saying they want to have a test on our soil and we'll have a test on their soil...are we going to accept that?

NITZE: Yes, we are....

DONALDSON: Would it not be well for the President...to stipulate that for the foreseeable future the U.S. and NATO nations remain committed to an integrated form of conventional and nuclear forces?

NITZE: I think he may do that.

DONALDSON: When are we going to have a deal?

NITZE: ...I think all those things can be done in not more than another couple of weeks...then we'll be prepared to tell the Russians what is a firm alliance.

FREE-FOR-ALL DISCUSSION

HINCKLEY

BRINKLEY: Should John Hinckley Jr. have been let go home?

DONALDSON: I think we should follow the law.

MAYNARD: Why don't we apply the law of common sense...

WILL: Once you have infused the law with psychology, then you have to have Hinckley on trial forever....

TRADE

BRINKLEY: The Japanese say the trade imbalance is our problem, not theirs -- so where do we go from here?

WILL:The answer has to be...for free trade.

MAYNARD: We're missing a very important element of the trade imbalance -- it has to do with the Third World. What needs to happen is a restructuring of their debt, a restructuring of their economies and an opening of their markets to the good and services that we export....

FACE THE NATION

MODERATOR: Lesley Stahl

GUESTS: Darrington D. Parker, U.S. District Court Judge; Joseph E. diGenova, U.S. attorney for the District of Columbia; William Carpenter, former psychiatrist for John Hinckley, Jr.; Professor Alan Dershowitz

STAHL: John Hinckley Jr., the young man who shot President Reagan, was found not guilty by reason of insanity. His doctors say he is now well enough to go home unescorted for a short visit; the government says he's not..... The verdict, not guilty by reason of insanity means that if Hinckley is declared cured, he must be released, despite the severity of his acts and despite public outcry.... I've heard people say about you, Judge, that it will be a cold day in hell when you release John Hinckley.

PARKER: You've seen comments that no doctor and no judge has the guts to do just that. But if the testimony supports it, certainly you must consider it. And the man was not found guilty of a crime. But I would be aware of the fact that the underlying crime for which he was not found guilty is assault, and that a person has been completely maimed for life. You can't help thinking that.

STAHL: Is there any reason you might think there was a cover-up, a deliberate cover-up, in this case?

diGENOVA: It is readily apparent from the fact that the hospital made the request on March 23rd, and then, on April 15th, after the hearing had started and testimony was given about the letter, it then withdrew its request for the release.

STAHL: It was revealed that the psychiatrist who testified on Hinckley's behalf was being paid by the Hinckley family.

diGENOVA: We were shocked when we discovered...the hospital revealed to us it had been the Hinckley family. That certainly raises questions for us and the NIMH which need to be looked into.

STAHL: Do you think Hinckley is being treated differently than the normal criminal mental patient because of the notoriety of his case?

DERSHOWITZ: Of course he's being treated differently.... The law is open-textured here. It leaves the psychiatrist tremendous discretion, it leaves the judge tremendous discretion and it leaves the U.S. Attorney tremendous discretion. This is a lawless area.

STAHL: Mr. diGenova, before you even knew about these letters to Ted Bundy, you were trying to prevent Hinckley from going home. On what grounds were you going to argue that he shouldn't be allowed to go home?

diGENOVA: Under law society made a contract with Mr. Hinckley. It says if you are guilty, you go to prison; if you are found not guilty by reason of insanity, you are indefinitely committed to a mental institution and then you get out when you can prove, by clear and convincing evidence, that you are no longer a danger to others....

STAHL: Do you think he should ever get out? diGENOVA: Absolutely not.

###

MEET THE PRESS

MODERATOR: Marvin Kalb PANEL: Anne Garrels, Robert Kaiser.
GUESTS: Speaker Jim Wright; Richard Perle, Assistant Secretary of Defense;
Georgi Arbatov, director of U.S.A. and Canada Institute of the Soviet Union.

KALB: Do you feel that there's going to be a summit late this year and there will be a new arms control agreement signed?

ARBATOV: It looks more possible, but I'm tremendously cautious.... I would say there was never such a chance given to any President of the United States as now to have really important steps in our Soviet/American relations, including an end to arms race.

KAISER: There's a certain amount of confusion in Washington about the Soviet position. You seemed to have flip-flopped twice now in the last year.... Why is the Soviet decision bouncing back and forth?

ARBATOV: You put it in a very wrong way. I don't call it flip-flop; I call it real flexibility in an attempt to untie the knots. It opened the way for the agreement. The Americans made an opposite, real flip-flop. We accept their proposal and they say, "No, we need something else."...

GARRELS: You've now proposed zero shorter-range missiles. Are you willing to allow Europeans to match some of those short-range missiles and not have zero but at least a few?

ARBATOV: From the beginning it was your proposal.... Now they (Europeans) have a second thought.

GARRELS: What about that second thought?

ARBATOV: We don't have it on the table.... something will simply derail it. Why not do away with all of them? United States will have to create an absolutely new and very expensive weapons system in order to reach this ceiling. Soviet Union proposes to do away in a very short period, with all its short range missiles so that U.S. will not be in need of creating this new weapons system. What is unfair here? It's not arms control you proposal. It's lowering the ceiling of Soviet weapon and creating American weapons.... I think our position was reasonable.

GUEST: Rep. Jim Wright

KALB: You are quoted as saying that this is the best opportunity since WW II to make real peace between the two super powers? What do you mean by real peace?

WRIGHT: I think peace is not just the absence of armed conflict, but a condition of understanding and an effort to accommodate the other.... I think there is a better chance (for an agreement) than there has been. We still have a long way to go. But I do discern a flexibility that hasn't been there before.

MEET THE PRESS (continued)

KAISER: Are you suggesting that there's been a fundamental change in the political culture of the Soviet Union?

WRIGHT: Oh no. I don't think we can say that the Soviet Union measures up to our standards of human rights. It surely doesn't. It never has. There's been some movement.... They're attempting to create a greater degree of flexibility at the local level and plant management. They have said that they released 1300 more people for immigration...in the first three months of this year than they did in the first three months of last year. All that's movement in the right direction, but it's like looking at a glacier. Any movement at all is significant.

GARRELS: Are you not concerned with all the enthusiasm for an agreement that the pressure might be such that the U.S. will agree to an arms control agreement that is less than adequate?

WRIGHT: I think there are people who do not want an arms control agreement.... But we've reached a point where it's to our advantage to get a legitimate arms control agreement....

KAISER: Some people seem to have the impression that Gorbachev is sort of desperate to help Ronald Reagan, that he keeps changing his position to help Reagan when he's down. What's your reading on Gorbachev's motivation?

WRIGHT: I don't think it's a personal matter. I think he's trying to move the peace process forward....

KALB: What are the major roadblocks toward an agreement that would bring down to zero medium-range and even smaller short-range?

WRIGHT: I'm not sure there are major roadblocks. I think it depends upon the agreement if our Western allies....

GUEST: RICHARD PERLE

KALB: What are the obstacles you see toward reaching this kind of medium-range agreement with the Soviet Union?

PERLE: There are some issues we haven't closed on yet. One of them is verification.... We have to settle this question of how to treat shorter-range missiles....

KAISER: Why is this proposal that's on the table more acceptable to you than many of the predecessors that you've criticized?

PERLE: This proposal to eliminate medium-range missiles is on that this Administration has supported from the very beginning. The Soviets now make it appear as though it's a Soviet initiative. It was Ronald Reagan's initiative and it took a lot of people by surprise.... I think what has been demonstrated is that with perseverance and persistence, the Soviets can be brought to change their position.

MEET THE PRESS (continued)

KAISER: Will this agreement redeem the Reagan Administration policies in this field; after eight years the only thing you've done is restore a kind of pre-1965 balance in Europe? Is that a big accomplishment?

PERLE: I would happily contrast the Reagan Administration to our national security with previous administrations who permitted our defenses to deteriorate... I think we have a very solid record of accomplishment.

GARRELS: Is this just a political victory or does this really mean anything for arms control?

PERLE: It makes a difference. It has to be seen in conjunction with other proposals, including the American proposal to reduce by 50 percent the number of strategic weapons.

GARRELS: But those proposals went nowhere during your talks in Moscow.

PERLE: I think it's clear the Soviets did not want seriously to discuss the 50 percent reductions and that ought to make us cautious. This isn't the millennium. And we're not going to save vast sums of money by eliminating intermediate nuclear weapons in Europe....In order to provide more effective conventional military capability we may have to spend more rather than less to maintain a reasonable level of security there.

KALB: Did Mr. Gorbachev present any new definition of what acceptable research might be on strategic defense.

PERLE: They have offered a number of definitions that all have the same very dangerous bottom line. It would prevent the U.S. from continuing with the program of research and development and strategic defense.... They support all forms of defense except our program. And, so, we would be compelled to terminate our SDI system.

KAISER: Are you really saying that they're making proposals that would allow them to continue and us not to continue?

PERLE: Absolutely, because the proposals they're making are utterly unverifiable. We wouldn't know whether they were complying or not....

GARRELS: What about nuclear testing?

PERLE: Well, if each of us tested one weapon...it's not adequate. It's a first step. In order to get real verification, we need to be able to send teams to the Soviet Union and they have to send teams to the United States.... That's the American proposal. If there is anything real to the Soviet notion of openness, they ought to accept that proposal, because there is no way it would do them any harm and it would give confidence....

KAISER. On a scale of one to ten, what are the odds of a summit and a deal in the next year?

PERLE: I would think the odds are quite good for a summit, provided we settle this issue of verifications and provided we get a satisfactory solution to the short-range missile problem.

MCLAUGHLIN GROUP

MODERATOR: John McLaughlin. PANEL: Carl Leusbendorf, Robert Novak, Jack Germond, Morton Kondracke.

ARMS AGREEMENT

MCLAUGHLIN: What does this add up to?

LEUBSDORF: What's happen is that Secretary Gorbachev has called President Reagan's bluff on this. He's going to get the agreement he wants.

NOVAK: The Soviets are playing us like a cheap accordion. The Administration is trapped. Everyone is so desperate to get some agreement, some kind of summit, that they are on the verge of agreeing to as nuclear-free Europe. What's next? The Pacific? I think they have to take a look at the long-range consequences.

GERMOND: The immediate response of any sane person, would be encouraged by the prospect of a sharp reduction of nuclear arms. But I am also concerned about the way and pace at which this is done. I'm also concerned about what is driving the Administration and the competence of this Administration and their ability to do a treaty that we can be safe with.

KONDRACKE: We're now stuffing down the throats of the Europeans the notion that all short-range nuclear missiles have got to be gotten rid of. Now, we want this deal so badly, we're going to make the Europeans give up that protection.

MCLAUGHLIN: The White House is concerned about the NATO allies.... Should the U.S. go forward with a Soviet deal that does include conventional force reduction?

LEUBSDORF: They probably shouldn't, but they probably will.

GERMOND: It isn't necessarily a question of conventional force reduction, it's a question of conventional force parody -- whether you can achieve that. One of the things they need to look at it taking a longer period to do this nuclear weapon reduction to allow for that conventional force parody.

NOVAK: A lot of the Democrats have been saying what we have to do is have a conventional deterrent....

KONDRACKE: If the Soviet tried a conventional invasion of Western Europe, we would be able to stop them with tactical nuclear weapons.... The balance that Shultz is going to try to force on the Europeans that the Soviets would have short-range missiles able to hit targets in West Germany. We are going to have a very short-range missiles which could be captured. So the Germans are going to be scared to death about this.

NOVAK: The danger is that you end up firing a strategic weapon for a submarine and therefore you have a worldwide nuclear conflict. You don't have the flexible response. And what we're all worried about is this mad rush for a summit...

MCLAUGHLIN GROUP continued:

MCLAUGHLIN : Give me the year and the month that nuclear weapons, when all the other nuclear weapons will be outside of Europe.

LEUBSDORF: Not in our lifetime. NOVAK: A couple of years.

GERMOND: At least two years, certainly not in Reagan's term.

KONDRACKE: By the end of Reagan's term. MCLAUGHLIN: I agree with Morton.

TRADE DEFICIT:

MCLAUGHLIN: Is Baker bombing as Treasury Secretary?

GERMOND: We don't know yet.... He's obviously in some trouble on this thing right now. Everyone knew this was a possibility.

NOVAK: What Secretary Baker tried to do -- a balancing act -- he was trying to put a floor on the dollar and not say he was doing it for fear on getting Congress all riled-up.... The trade deficit is absolutely meaningless...and what Jim Baker did this week is something he should have done a long time ago -- he firmed-up the dollar by saying that there is a floor. The real question is what is the FED going to do?

KONDRACKE: This is just garbage.... If Jim Baker had his way I think you would have a grand deal whereby you cut the deficit by having a tax increase and by limiting entitlements. Baker is not going to propose that.

LEUBSDORF; That's exactly the problem and until the President excepts some kind of deal like this, that problem isn't going to be solved....

MCLAUGHLIN: I want to know whether now is the time to head to the fire exit as far as stocks and bonds are concerned -- to get out - to sell.

LEUBSDORF: For the long term, probably no.

NOVAK: We've got better things ahead. GERMOND: I don't know.

KONDRACKE: I agree with Carl. MCLAUGHLIN: Carl & Mort are correct.

PREDICTIONS

LEUBSDORF: When Congress begins Iran hearing, the first witness will be former National Security Advisor Robert McFarlane.

NOVAK: The Marine Embassy scandal has not reached it's peak yet.

GERMOND: These Democrats on the second tier will begin attacking Hart, trying to draw him into a confrontation.

KONDRACKE: Watch out for a write-in campaign - Howard Baker for President.

MCLAUGHLIN: Paul Volcker will be reappointed to a third term.

###

AGRONSKY & COMPANY

MODERATOR: Martin Agronsky. PANEL: James J. Kilpatrick Jr., Carl Rowan, Tom Oliphant, Hugh Sidney.

FCC RULING

AGRONSKY: The FCC warns stations which permit such dirty language -- face fines, criminal prosecution or even loss of their broadcast licenses. Is the FCC right to do this?

KILPATRICK: I really am of two minds on this ruling -- this is ugly stuff on the air, civilized society ought not to have to tolerate it, a certain number of people who would be offended by it in the few second it would take to turn off the set, but I'm awfully concerned about giving the government agency the power to say, in this way, what is indecent.

ROWAN: I'm in agreement.

OLIPHANT: What I think we see here is an Administration caught in a vice in terms of its being in the control of special interest groups. On the one hand, the job is to regulate broadcasting in the public interest. Well, the corporations don't want to do that, so the Reagan Administration tries deregulation. On the other hand, right wing extremists hollow for censorship of dirty words -- they jump in and try to do that. It's inherently contradictory policy.

SIDNEY: The fact of the matter is that the government doles out these licenses. The government is the one who decided. It's a quasi-public utility, so therefore, I think there must be or there is reason for some standards. There are community standards. There are standards of decency. I think excess inevitably breeds another regulation.... It seems to me it was necessary for the government to make some statement on this since they give the licenses.

AGRONSKY: I cannot forget the words of Justice Black -- any law that has bridged the first amendment -- and Black always said no law means no law.

U.S./SOVIET RELATIONS

AGRONSKY: Hugh, both (the President and Secretary Shultz) seemed agreed there is a real prospect -- we can come to an agreement to removal intermediate nuclear missiles from Europe and we may be able to go forward with a Russian proposal to remove short-range nuclear missiles from Europe. You were at a meeting with General Scowcroft...where are you on this?

SIDNEY: He (General Scowcroft) is disturbed by it. The irony here is the political cross-currents that have come on. Many people have argued strongly against Reagan for not having some agreement in his six years on the job, condemned him. And now, suddenly, some portion of that group has come around and said. "Look -- this is the wrong agreement." And Scowcroft understands that. He says that for 40 years we have what is known as the flexible response.... He sees this process beginning to get a nuclear-free Europe, which he thinks raises the possibility of super power exchange of nuclear weapon.

AGRONSKY & COMPANY (continued)

OLIPHANT: Obviously we can get rid of the short-range nuclear weapons. But even if you do that, there are still hundreds of these so-called tactical battlefield nuclear weapons. Also, the short-range missiles are only in the hands of the Soviet Union. We don't have any.

SIDNEY: His point is that that's the next step. He says what this does is opens up to a very clever maneuver, Mr. Gorbachev, to say, altogether, let's get rid of the tactical weapons. And Scowcroft says one other thing interesting too. He says he thinks the politics behind this make is inevitable. We're going to get this whether he like it or not. And Europe -- they're very disturbed by it.

ROWAN: Well, we may get it but I don't think it will come as easily as the headlines of today look.... And there's still a lot of people in this government who don't want any arms agreement.

AGRONSKY: The Secretary of State himself was asked by reporters who suggested that the Soviet proposal on medium-range missiles had put the United States in a box.... If we've been placed in a box -- it's a wonderful box to be in. We've been working from day one to bring about radical reduction of these weapons and we're moving toward achievement.

KILPATRICK: I think you must maintain some nuclear deterrent in Europe....

OLIPHANT: I think we must take some of the concerns of our NATO allies with a grain of salt. Part of what they are really saying is that they would like to have more of a nuclear deterrent because they don't want to spend very much on conventional weapons.

ROWAN: ...It may well be that his (the President's) best place in history we be that he cut a deal with the evil empire on the missiles business.

SIDNEY: ...The fact of the matter is if the Soviets keep their conventional forces that we ought to make part of this agreement that we negotiate reductions of conventional forces.

TARIFFS

AGRONSKY: The President consistently opposed high tariffs and protectionism feeling in the end it would hurt this country, but now he's yielded. Was he wise to do that?

OLIPHANT: No, he was foolish.... This is the most protectionist American President since WWII. The road the President has taken this country down leads only to higher interest rates, recession.

KILPATRICK: Nonsense. This had to be done. The Japanese brought it on themselves. This may be the one thing that motivates that Japanese finally to do the things they should have done years ago.

SIDNEY: I don't understand Tom's definition of him as a protectionist President. He has fought this all the way, but he's had to light backfires...or else we would have gotten overwhelmingly bad legislation.

-End of News Summary-



News Summary

OFFICE OF THE PRESS SECRETARY

MONDAY, APRIL 20, 1987 -- 6 a.m. EDT EDITION

TODAY'S HEADLINES

INTERNATIONAL NEWS

REAGAN SET TO DEAL WITH ARMS, TRADE -- President Reagan returns to the White House to lobby for an arms pact with the Soviets and a trade settlement with the Japanese.
(Baltimore Sun, USA Today, Washington Times)

NEGOTIATORS ON BOTH SIDES WARN THAT PITFALLS REMAIN -- American and Soviet arms control experts warned of pitfalls before a superpower weapons agreement is signed, despite growing optimism by the leaders of both countries.
(Washington Times, AP, Reuter, UPI)

U.S. SANCTIONS ON JAPANESE GOODS WILL STAY IN PLACE, YEUTTER -- U.S. trade sanctions against Japan, announced last Friday, will stay in place for the time being, U.S. Trade Representative Clayton Yeutter said.
(Wall Street Journal, Reuter)

NETWORK NEWS (Sunday Evening)

ARMS CONTROL -- U.S. and Soviet officials expressed cautious optimism about chances for an agreement to eliminate nuclear missiles in Europe.

IRAN-CONTRA -- Attorney General Meese said he didn't ask CIA director Casey about the diversion of money to the contras from the sale of U.S. weapons to Iran.

INTERNATIONAL NEWS...A-2
NATIONAL NEWS.....A-9
IRAN-NICARAGUA.....A-10
NETWORK NEWS.....B-1
SUNDAY TALK SHOWS....C-1

INTERNATIONAL NEWS

ARMS CONTROL, TRADE PUT REAGAN 'BACK ON THE OFFENSIVE'

Predictions of a Reagan presidency permanently crippled by the Iran-contra affair may have been premature.

An American version of "glasnost," or openness, has replaced the secrecy and paranoia in the White House just two months ago.

Moreover, arms control, trade and battles with Congress over domestic spending have helped President Reagan project a take-charge image that has diverted much of the nation's attention from the Iran-contra episode.

The President is "back on the offensive," said Chief of Staff Howard Baker's longtime aide, James Cannon.

(Jeremiah O'Leary & Willis Witter, Washington Times, A1)

Reagan Set To Deal With Arms, Trade

President Reagan returns to the White House to lobby for an arms pact with the Soviets and a trade settlement with the Japanese.

The Administration hopes Reagan can continue to set the agenda -- keeping his distance from the Iran-contra scandal, the subject of congressional hearings starting May 4.

Reagan, after a 10-day vacation at his Santa Barbara ranch, faces a busy schedule:

- Making progress toward arms control, the centerpiece for a superpowers summit. Though Reagan hasn't embraced the Soviet plan, he's called it "the right direction." He meets this week with congressional leaders on the Soviet proposal to ban medium-range weapons in Europe and provide inspection at superpower nuclear test sites.
- Walking a trade tightrope. Japanese Foreign Minister Shintaro Abe is in Washington for talks with officials on Reagan's raising \$300 million in tariffs against Japanese computers, power tools and TV sets in retaliation for Japan's closed market. Reagan is expected to use the trade war to ward off Congress' protectionist mood.

(Johanna Neuman, USA Today, A1)

Broader Issues Stressed As Reagan Returns

SANTA BARBARA -- President Reagan returns to Washington after a 10-day Easter vacation facing trade and budget battles with Congress and holding our fresh hope that an arms control agreement with the Soviet Union is within reach.

Armed with fresh strategies for foreign and domestic policy, the White House aims to "shape" a broad political agenda as Reagan tries to recover from the Iran-contra scandal.

"Part of what the planning phase is looking at are the issues we'll be facing...and you look at them in a broader context," said a senior White House official who was involved in daily strategy sessions at this seaside resort town.

These brain-storming sessions, which have included a longtime Reagan consultant, Stewart Spencer, and the Republican pollster Richard Wirthlin, have addressed such issues as budget reform, trade, arms control and the Administration's approach to AIDS.

(Julie Johnson, Baltimore Sun, A1)

U.S. NEGOTIATOR WARY ON ARMS DEAL

A senior U.S. arms negotiator adopted a more cautious attitude toward a superpower arms agreement than that demonstrated recently by President Reagan and other American officials.

"We don't have an agreement until the details are nailed down," said Paul Nitze, who was in Moscow last week with Secretary Shultz, on ABC's "This Week With David Brinkley."

A Soviet arms negotiator, Viktor Karpov, said on the same program the Soviet Union was willing to negotiate reductions in conventional, non-nuclear forces as well as lower the numbers of nuclear weapons in Europe.

"In this process we are ready to negotiate the redresses on any imbalances that are there or might be here in conventional forces," Karpov said. Karpov said it was "a clearcut position of our country" that the Soviet Union was willing to negotiate lower levels of conventional forces in Europe, a point made less directly by Soviet leader Gorbachev in a speech in Prague earlier this month. (Reuter)

Soviet, American Officials Cautious On Arms Control

Soviet and American officials are warning that although there has been dramatic progress in the search for an arms control agreement, last-minute problems could endanger the disarmament process.

Despite those notes of caution, expressed on two television programs Sunday, one Soviet official said he believed that at last week's visit to Moscow by Secretary Shultz, groundwork was laid for a summit meeting this year between President Reagan and Soviet leader Gorbachev.

"We suggested to Mr. Shultz, in fact, an exact deal that would lead to the meeting of Mr. President with our general secretary, in the autumn or at the end of the year," Viktor Karpov, the chief Soviet arms control official, said on ABC's "This Week With David Brinkley."

On NBC's "Meet the Press," Richard Perle, the assistant defense secretary who oversees Pentagon arms control matters, expressed similar guarded optimism.

"I would think the chances are quite good for a summit...provided we settle the issue of verification, and provided we get a satisfactory solution to the short-range missile problem," Perle said. He said that as negotiators come closer to solutions, they have to be very careful because "the details can go horribly wrong." (Alan Fram, AP)

Negotiators On Both Sides Warn That Pitfalls Remain

American and Soviet arms control experts warned of pitfalls before a superpower weapons agreement is signed, despite growing optimism by the leaders of both countries.

Assistant Defense Secretary Richard Perle, who accompanied Secretary Shultz to Moscow, cautioned that the Soviets will not discuss a reduction in strategic nuclear weapons and still want the U.S. to abandon SDI.

Another trouble spot, Perle said on NBC's "Meet the Press," is whether the Soviet Union will accept U.S. proposals to verify compliance with any arms control agreement.

"This isn't the millennium," Perle said. "The Soviets are not laying down their arms. Peace isn't going to break out."

Soviet spokesman Georgi Arbatov, also appearing on NBC, accused Perle of being the "principle monkeywrench-thrower in the arms control machine."

Arbatov, like Perle, was cautious about predicting an arms control agreement. (Mary Belcher, Washington Times, A5)

Experts Warn Of Pitfalls To Arms Agreement

The House Armed Services Committee chairman, joining other U.S. and Soviet experts in warning of pitfalls to a superpower arms control agreement, says the pact being negotiated now "is a little bit dangerous" -- an indication that President Reagan's optimism may not be shared on Capitol Hill.

Rep. Les Aspin said the pact being worked out "worries me a very, very great deal. I think that this business of gradually eliminating sections of nuclear weapons is not a very smart idea, given the fact that as long as there's a conventional (forces) imbalance in Europe we're going to need nuclear weapons."

"It's a process there that I think is a little bit dangerous," said the former Pentagon analyst, indicating potential opposition in Congress. "We're eliminating the safest weapons and leaving in the most dangerous."

(Henry David Rosso, UPI)

Europeans Wary Of Missile Removal

PARIS -- Europeans are increasingly wary of Soviet General Secretary Gorbachev's offer to remove all Eurormissiles, and French defense experts say a deal could prove to be a trap.

Caution is being expressed in Britain, West Germany and at NATO headquarters in Brussels.

French Foreign Minister Jean-Bernard Raimond has warned repeatedly that denuclearizing Western Europe would leave it exposed to the Soviet alliance's 3-to-1 advantage in conventional armed forces.

(Tom Nuzum, Washington Times, A7)

ADELMAN WANTS U.S.-SOVIET ARMS PACT IN SINGLE PACKAGE Deal Would Be Designed To Allay European Fears

U.S. officials have several potential responses to Moscow's latest arms control offer, including one allowing the superpowers to retain some short-range missiles in Europe, according to the director of the U.S. Arms Control and Disarmament Agency.

"The big considerations are, can you have a good INF deal without adding fuel to the bad idea of the denuclearization of Western Europe?" Adelman said. "And the answer, I think, is yes."

Adelman and other senior officials said the U.S. would now like to wrap all the issues into a single treaty, ending years of often divisive debate with U.S. allies over nuclear weapons in Europe.

(Warren Strobel & James Dorsey, Washington Times, A5)

DEMOCRATS PLAN ACTION ON ARMS CONTROL MEASURES

Democratic leaders, back from arms control discussions in Moscow, plan House action this week on nuclear amendments designed to push President Reagan toward an accord with the Soviets.

But the Administration is threatening to veto the action, not only because it doesn't want restrictions put on its arms talks but also because Reagan considers the underlying legislation a budget buster.

With U.S.-Soviet discussions also in high gear, the House Appropriations Committee has added a pair of nuclear arms amendments to an \$11 billion spending package scheduled for House action on Wednesday or Thursday.

The bill would eliminate almost all tests of U.S. nuclear weapons. The Democrats also would require the U.S. to comply with the unratified SALT II nuclear arms control treaty.

(Steven Komarow, AP)

SOVIETS FIRE BACK ON RIGHTS Kremlin Says U.S. Has Own Problems

MOSCOW -- The Soviet Union escalated its human rights counteroffensive in meetings with U.S. officials here last week, responding to charges of Soviet human rights abuses with accusations that the United States harbors criminals and has its own problems with racism, sexism and poverty.

One senior American diplomat called the Soviet tactic "nonsense," and "cynical." Other U.S. officials here said they have conceded that the U.S. has had to work to improve its civil rights record, but told Soviet leaders that such tactical responses to widespread concerns in the West about Soviet human rights abuses will not gain them any points.

In meetings with Central Committee Secretary Anatoliy Dobrynin and other Soviet officials, Rep. Steny Hoyer said he stressed that the West views a serious Soviet approach toward human rights offenses as a "litmus test" for the credibility of Soviet democratization and economic reform.

(Gary Lee, Washington Post, A17)

WRIGHT, SOVIET SAY GORBACHEV MISINTERPRETED

U.S. and Soviet officials denied that Soviet leader Gorbachev seriously suggested to visiting American legislators that the U.S. set up special areas for blacks and other minorities.

"He's not foolish," commented House Speaker Jim Wright, one of the congressmen who was in Moscow last week, on NBC's "Meet the Press." "He was talking in terms of what they are trying to do in order to create more integrity for their ethnic minorities in their country."

(Reuter story, Washington Post, A22)

'PINSTripES' MAY BE NEXT IN EMBASSY SPY PROBE

Foreign Service officers and civilians at the U.S. Embassy in Moscow probably knew of illegal Marine fraternization with Soviet women and may become the subject of a separate investigation into the sex-for-secrets scandal, say senior Administration officials.

Responsibility for the scandal stretches far beyond the Marine Corps, according to the officials and an internal memorandum endorsed by Marine Corps commandant, Gen. Paul X. Kelley.

U.S. officials do not exclude the possibility that U.S. diplomats may have themselves engaged in illegal fraternization with Soviet nationals.

(James Dorsey, Washington Times, A1)

U.S. SANCTIONS ON JAPANESE GOODS WILL STAY IN PLACE, YEUTTER

TOKYO -- U.S. trade sanctions against Japan, announced last Friday, will stay in place for the time being, U.S. Trade Representative Clayton Yeutter said.

Asked whether the sanctions would continue following Japanese requests they be removed, Yeutter told Reuters: "Oh sure. We've told them that over and over already. If they have questions about them, then we will be prepared to answer."

Yeutter's comments appeared to undermine hopes that special Japanese envoy Shintaro Abe, in Washington to ask for early removal of the sanctions, will be successful.

(Greg McCune, Reuter)

Trade Sanctions Expected To Last At Least To June

The stiff tariffs President Reagan imposed on certain Japanese electronic consumer goods are likely to remain in effect until at least mid-June and maybe longer, according to U.S. officials.

As a practical matter, it will take at least two months for the U.S. to obtain new statistical information on Japanese semiconductor sales. "We just can't phony up the figures," said a senior trade negotiator. "And as for dumping, it just has to stop."

(Eduardo Lachica & Ellen Hume, Wall Street Journal, A3)

JAPANESE WARNED ON TRADE House Leader Sees Tough Sanctions Bill

OISO, Japan -- The House of Representatives will pass a trade bill containing the highly controversial Gephardt amendment mandating punitive action against Japan and other countries with large trade surpluses, House Majority Leader Thomas Foley predicted.

Foley's comments shocked Japanese officials here, who already were upset by President Reagan's imposition of stiff tariffs on certain Japanese imports in response to alleged dumping of semiconductors by Japan.

Sen. Jay Rockefeller added that the mood in the Senate is drifting toward tougher legislation likely to include language similar to the Gephardt amendment.

Foley said that the Reagan Administration was misjudging the situation in Congress, placing undue faith in the prospect that the trade bill passed by the Ways and Means Committee without the Gephardt provision would prevail.

(Hobart Rowen, Washington Post, A17)

ARGENTINA EXPLODES WITH JOY AS ARMY REBELLION ENDS

BUENOS AIRES -- Hundreds of thousands of Argentines singing their national anthem greeted word from President Raul Alfonsin that a four-day army rebellion had ended with the peaceful surrender of the rebels.

Alfonsin, 61, made his announcement last night before an estimated 400,000 people outside Government House in Buenos Aires. He had returned from a meeting with rebel leader Lt. Col. Aldo Rico at the Campo de Mayo army base on the outskirts of the capital.

The rebel army officers, meanwhile, celebrated their surrender as a victory.

"We believe the president and the leaders of the main political parties have understood that this can be the starting point for the reconciliation of all Argentines," Rico said.

A message of support for Alfonsin was received from President Reagan. Reagan's message, released by a White House Spokesman in Santa Barbara, Calif., where the President was spending Easter, said the U.S. had "supported Argentine democracy since its restoration in 1983 and we strongly reaffirm our support of President Alfonsin and the continued rule of law in Argentina."

(Stewart Russell, Reuter)

Argentina's President Wins Rebel Surrender

BUENOS AIRES -- President Raul Alfonsin, pulling Argentina back from the brink of bloodshed, personally confronted Army rebels at an infantry school they were holding and accepted their surrender.

The presidential action appeared to reaffirm civilian rule in a country rocked by half a century of military coups. Commentators praised the peaceful outcome as an encouraging sign of the consolidation of democracy. But amid the euphoria of the moment, serious questions lingered about the future ability of Army commanders to enforce discipline among lower-ranking officers who had refused to move against the rebels.

(Bradley Graham, Washington Post, A1)

PLO SQUAD IS CRUSHED INSIDE ISRAEL

KIRYAT SHEMONA, Israel -- Israeli soldiers clashed with a heavily armed Palestinian unit on a hostage-taking mission inside Israel's northern border, leaving the three guerrillas and two soldiers dead, the Israeli Army and radio reported.

It was the first attempted infiltration of the area by Palestinian guerrillas in more than a year and the first time since before Israel's 1982 invasion of Lebanon that guerrillas succeeded in penetrating Israel's northern border, scene of numerous bloody operations in the 1970s.

(Glenn Frankel, Washington Post, A1)

Israeli Helicopters Raid Lebanon After Guerrilla Infiltration

JERUSALEM -- Israeli helicopter gunships attacked South Lebanon after two Israeli soldiers died in a clash with three Palestinian guerrilla infiltrators seeking to take hostages in northern Israel, the army said.

The infiltrators carried leaflets that said they were sent by the Fatah faction of the PLO to seize hostages to exchange for Palestinians in Israeli jails, the army said.

(Galina Vromen, Reuter)

NATIONAL NEWS

REAGAN RETURNS TO WASHINGTON TODAY

SANTA BARBARA -- President Reagan, ending a nine-day vacation in the Santa Ynez Mountains, returns to Washington trying to keep up momentum for an arms control agreement but sure to butt heads with Congress on the budget.

After a retreat interrupted repeatedly by developments in the U.S.-Soviet arena, Reagan is aware that Democrats intend to press hard on the budget in the weeks ahead. His radio address during the weekend focused on arms control, but the Democratic response for the third straight week dealt with the budget.

The President and the First Lady were due back in Washington late Monday after an unusually high-profile retreat that his new staff used to plot a course for the final 21 months of his presidency.

The Reagans, who savor the privacy of their mountain home, had reporters to the ranch Thursday for a visit by Secretary Shultz, ventured down the road Saturday to a camp for young cancer patients and marked Easter Sunday with a surprise trip to the First Presbyterian Church in Santa Barbara.

(Norman Sandler, UPI)

FOREIGNERS GET U.S. FARM SUBSIDIES

GAO Says Overseas Investors
Collected \$7.7 Million in 1985

Investors from West Germany and the Netherlands Antilles received more than \$3 million in American farm program subsidies in 1985 through ownership of U.S. farmland, according to a General Accounting Office study.

The GAO study of 401 U.S. counties where the bulk of foreign-owned farmland is located found that 598 foreign owners received \$7.7 million of the subsidies intended to support U.S. farmers' income and offset losses caused by surplus-crop reduction programs.

Almost half the 598 owners were corporations, suggesting that the Agriculture Department subsidies provided incentives for investing in American farmland. Twenty-one foreign-owned corporations received payments of at least \$50,000 each, while one in Sherman County, Oregon, was paid \$71,680.

(Ward Sinclair, Washington Post, A13)

IRAN-NICARAGUA

A SACRIFICED ADVANTAGE

Whatever else the Iran-contra scandal may have done, it has usefully put to rest the once-widespread belief that President Reagan was exempt from the laws of political gravity.

In Washington, the notion of Reagan invulnerability blossomed into the Teflon theory, so-called because nothing was supposed to stick to him. Teflon had a catchy ring and a Reaganesque quality of sounding significant while explaining nothing.

The voters are not boobs, despite the temptation of defeated politicians to see them in this light. Polls taken for the White House showed widespread recognition that Reagan was often distanced and ill-informed. However, many voters valued peace and prosperity more than a display of knowledge at a news conference. When the Iran-contra disclosures made Americans realize that the price for presidential disengagement was higher than they had recognized, many changed their minds.

Now, after all the explanations, two of three Americans tell the pollsters they do not believe Reagan's repeated assertion that he knew nothing about the diversion of Iran arms sales proceeds to the contras. To the majority of Americans, the President has become just another disbelieved politician. And the Teflon theory, never much to begin with, has perished along with Reagan's credibility.

(Lou Cannon, Washington Post, A2)

NOTORIOUS SYRIAN TIED TO NORTH

Arms For Contras Bought Through Suspected Terrorist

Marine Lt. Col. Oliver North's private arms network purchased 158 tons of assault rifles and ammunition for the Nicaraguan rebels last year from a reputed international narcotics smuggler and terrorist linked to the Achille Lauro hijackers.

Sources familiar with the sale identified the arms dealer as Manzer al-Kassar, a 42-year-old Syrian who reportedly has supplied arms to Mohammed Abul Abbas -- head of the Palestine Liberation Front and reputed mastermind of the 1985 Achille Lauro hijacking in the Mediterranean -- and to other radical Palestinian groups.

The arms were purchased by a company linked to retired Air Force Maj. Gen. Richard Secord and his business associate, Albert Hakim. Both men have figured prominently in the Iran-contra scandal.

The purchase of the arms from al-Kassar was confirmed by congressional investigators.

(Newsday story, Baltimore Sun, A1)

NETWORK NEWS SUMMARY FOR SUNDAY, APRIL 19, 1987

ARMS CONTROL

ABC's SAM DONALDSON: Reagan Administration officials are continuing their optimistic talk about chances for a new arms control agreement with the Soviets. But there were some words of caution and even outright opposition voiced today as well.

JEANNE MESERVE: Appearing on "This Week With David Brinkley," Arms Advisor Paul Nitze pointed to the progress already made on arms control. An agreement between the U.S. and the Soviet Union to conduct nuclear tests on each other's territory.

(NITZE: "Yes, we will accept that. That (when) is being worked out. It hasn't been decided exactly.")

The exchange is intended to improve verification methods for nuclear testing. Verification remains one of the obstacles to an agreement on removing medium-range nuclear missiles from Europe. But, it's not the only one. If the super powers agree to keep 100 intermediate-range warheads apiece, the U.S. wants the freedom to put theirs in Alaska -- right next door to the Soviet Union.

(NITZE: "It's important for us not to give up the right to have them in Alaska. And we have not.")

But will the Soviets object to that?

(VIKTOR KARPOV: "Yes - sure. You see the situation now is that no medium-range missiles of the Soviet Union are deployed in a way to reach the U.S. territory, even Alaska.")

Administration negotiators today tried to dampen expectations that the issues blocking a medium-range accord will be easily resolved.

(RICHARD PERLE, Assistant Secretary of Defense: "Until the black and white is there and the "i"s are dotted and the "t"s crossed, you can't be sure that you've concluded a successful agreement.")

The head of the House Armed Services Committee said today that he, like the European allies, is worried not just about the specific terms of a medium-range accord, but it's total affect.

(REP. LES ASPIN: "I think that this business of gradually eliminating sections of nuclear weapons is not a very smart ideal, given the fact that as long as there's the conventional imbalance in Europe, we're going to need nuclear weapons.")

But Paul Nitze said today he does not think European sentiment will block an arms deal. And both American and Soviet participants in the negotiations continue to express optimism that there will be an arms accord and a summit this year.

DONALDSON: NATO commander General Bernard Rogers, whose replacement has already been announced, has denounced the prospective agreement to Newsweek, saying such a pact would make Western Europe safe for conventional war and that Moscow might one day use it's superior conventional force to intimidate, coerce and blackmail European nations.

(ABC-5)

CBS's SUE SPENCER: Prospects for a U.S./Soviet arms deal is certainly better now than when (the President) left Washington 10 days ago.

CBS's JACQUELINE ADAMS: There are signs that the President and his advisors have deliberately begun to temper their public optimism that an agreement to eliminate intermediate-range missiles in Europe is imminent. Despite the progress they made last week in Moscow, two of the President's arms controls experts warn that difficult issues remain.

(PAUL NITZE: "We don't have an agreement until everything is agreed, until the last commas are agreed to.")

(RICHARD PERLE: "This isn't the millennium. The Soviets have not laying down their arms, peace isn't going to break out.")

Sources say Administration officials believe they may have mishandled the public relations of last week's talks, but being openly optimistic too early and by letting Soviet leader Gorbachev take the credit for what originally was a Ronald Reagan proposal to eliminate Euro-missiles. Even today the Soviets tried to sound as if they were in the driver's seat.

(GEORGI ARBATOV: "I would say there was never such a chance given to any President of the United States as now, to have really important steps in Soviet/American relations.")

By the end of May, Administration officials hope to present a detailed allied response to the Soviets. In the meantime, sources say the Reagan team plans are cautious while plotting the President's arms control public relations counteroffensive. (CBS-8)

NBC's CONNIE CHUNG: U.S. and Soviet officials expressed cautious optimism today about chances for an agreement to eliminate nuclear missiles in Europe. President Reagan is ready to push for approval of a deal.

ROBIN LLOYD: Top officials say the latest Soviet proposals brought back from Moscow by Secretary of State Shultz will be at the top of the President's agenda when he returns to Washington tomorrow. They say he intends to contact allied leaders personally to try to persuade them to go along with eliminating most if not all medium and short-range missiles in Europe. Some European leaders are worried that this would make them more vulnerable to a Soviet attack. But Administration officials disagree.

(RICHARD PERLE: "What is accomplished is the elimination of 1400 warheads on Soviet SS 20s in exchange for which the U.S. would be giving up a little over 300 warheads of comparable systems. So that part of the agreement is a very good outcome for the United States.")

But ABC's "This Week" the President's special advisor on arms control, Ambassador Paul Nitze, said no decision will be made until this is discussed with the allies.

(NITZE: "We've got to have serious consultation with them about it.")

But already, four days after Shultz ended his talks with the Soviets, the U.S. position is becoming increasingly clear. Medium-range and short-range missiles would be eliminated from Europe, but smaller, tactical battlefield nuclear weapons wouldn't be effected. The U.S. has some 4,000 of these weapons now in Europe and top officials say they want no limits placed on them. That drew criticism from Democratic Congressman Les Aspin.

(ASPIN: "We've taking out the safest missiles and leaving in the most dangerous.")

But other key Democrats have been optimistic about the prospects of an arms control agreement. And a Soviet spokesman today appeared to agree.

NBC's Lloyd continues:

(GEORGI ARBATOV: "I would say there was never such a chance given to any President of the U.S. as now.")

White House officials say they expect the President will decide within the next few weeks to largely accept the Soviet proposals to eliminate medium and short-range missiles in Europe. But they emphasize this could change if the European allies express strong objections.

CHUNG: The Soviet Union conducted two underground nuclear tests today, raising the total to six since ending a self-imposed testing freeze in February. Both devices have the force of 20,000 tons on dynamite.

(NBC-4)

IRAN-CONTRA

DONALDSON: There was an echo from the Iran arms sales story today. Attorney General Edwin Meese has told the Washington Post he didn't ask CIA Director William Casey about the diversion of money to the contra rebels from the sale of U.S. arms to Iran, even though he had the chance, because he said it would have been inappropriate. Meese said a few hours after he read the memo disclosing such diversion, he dropped by Casey's home for a beer and chat, but didn't bring up the subject, because he said Casey wouldn't have known anything about that.

(ABC-4, NBC-10)

ARGENTINA

DONALDSON: A small but potentially dangerous military revolt against the civilian government appears to have ended, put down in dramatic fashion by the President himself. The President went to the rebel camp, confronted their leader and secured their surrender and arrest....

(ABC-Lead, ABC-Lead, NBC-8)

SOUTH KOREA

CHUNG: In Seoul, South Korea, anti-government protest turned rough today when a huge force of riot police tried to control demonstrators who had spilled onto the city streets. The thousands of protesters had gathered to mark the anniversary of a bloody student uprising in 1960....

(NBC-Lead, ABC-3)

TERRORISTS IN ISRAEL

SPENCER: A bloody Sunday it was in the Holy Land. At least two Israeli soldiers and three Palestinian guerrillas were killed in a violent border clash. The Israelis then retaliated with an air raid near the Palestinian refugee camp. The Israelis say it all started when guerrilla crossed the security zone near an isolated border community planning, they say, to kidnap civilian hostages. Israeli soldiers spotted the guerrillas and opened fired, killing the infiltrators and loosing two of their own. Later Israeli helicopter gunships rockets a suspected guerrilla hideout, two people were wounded....

(CBS-2, ABC-2, NBC-2)

KOREAN TRADE

DONALDSON: Commerce Secretary Malcolm Baldrige warned South Korea today it must open its markets to American goods or risk the same kind of stiff tariffs on its own exports to the U.S. that Washington has now imposed on some products from Japan. Baldrige spoke at a luncheon in the Korean Capitol in Seoul.... (ABC-7)

WATER & POWER

CHUNG: The Reagan Administration had a chance this past week to cut the federal budget by about \$70 million a year, by ending water subsidies to some big corporate farms in the West. Instead, it allowed a loophole to keep the money flowing.... (NBC-11)

SERVICES TO ABUSED CHILDREN

SPENCER: A House Committee report out tonight charges that the Reagan Administration has illegally denied service to abused children, by, it says, withholding millions of dollars in Congressional approved aid. Committee Republicans disagreed with the report's conclusions which says that programs for child abuse prevention, latchkey children and teenagers, all were denied funds.... (CBS-10)

REAGAN'S EASTER

DONALDSON: President and Mrs. Reagan attended regular morning services at the First Presbyterian church in Santa Barbara -- the second Easter in a row the President has attended church.
(TV coverage: The President and Mrs. Reagan leaving church)
(ABC-10, CBS-8, NBC-4)

THIS WEEK WITH DAVID BRINKLEY

MODERATOR: David Brinkley. PANEL: George Will, Sam Donaldson, Bob Maynard

GUESTS: Paul Nitze, Presidential Adviser on Arms Control; Viktor Karpov, Soviet Arms Control Authority, and Rep. Les Aspin.

BRINKLEY: Mr. Aspin...tell us what you've learned.

ASPIN: The line is...here's a chance to deal.... They want us to go back and kind of help put pressure on the Administration to move the whole thing along.

BRINKLEY: You going to do that?

ASPIN: Some of (the delegation) think its a good idea, other think it's not.

BRINKLEY: What do you think?

ASPIN: I'm worried about it.... This business of gradually eliminating sections of nuclear weapons is not a very smart idea, given the conventional imbalance in Europe.... I think what we've doing in this whole process is that we're eliminating the safest weapons and leaving the most dangerous....

WILL: Does the Administration accept the fact that we need nuclear weapons in Europe?

ASPIN: I don't know.

WILL: What would happen to the defense budget were we to have what the President says he wants...?

ASPIN: In order of magnitude...we would need another 10 divisions on our side...it's big bucks.

DONALDSON: Now it appears he (the President) is serious about arms control and you don't like it.

ASPIN: The problem is this Administration is totally schizophrenic about arms control....

DONALDSON: Will the Democrats continue to press this package that you started last fall or is it a dead issue?

ASPIN: I think they will.

GUEST: Ambassador Karpov

KARPOV: The prospect of resolving the security in Europe, I cannot accept because of that accent he (Aspin) made on the necessity to redress the balance in conventional forces before we even start to to speak about reduction or even elimination of nuclear weapons in Europe....

-more-

THIS WEEK WITH DAVID BRINKLEY (continued)

WILL: Is it the Soviet position that as an ultimate goal, Europe should be denuclearized and the Soviet Union should retain its enormous conventional and chemical force imbalance?

KARPOV: Yes, we are ready to negotiate every aspect of the problems you raised. Now we are ready to negotiate the elimination of medium-range missiles in Europe. Then we are ready to negotiate the reductions in conventional forces, together with the reductions in tactical weapons.... So there is no problem for us.... So the problem is to start. We are trying to convince the NATO countries almost a year now, reductions of these forces....

DONALDSON: Is it correct that you are willing to negotiate total elimination of the intermediate-range missiles, not preserving the 100 on each side?

KARPOV: That's another problem. We are ready to negotiate elimination of all medium forces as a final go. But we took into consideration other balances...

DONALDSON: Do you think the President wants to reach an agreement?

KARPOV: I think there is a possibility now to reach an agreement, if there is real willingness to do so without artificial obstacles.... I cannot say for the President. I can say for our side. Our side is ready for an agreement this year as well.

GUEST: Ambassador Nitze

BRINKLEY: You have been negotiating arms control reductions with the Soviet Union more or less forever -- what's the difference this time? What has happened over there?

NITZE: It isn't that different....

BRINKLEY: Do you know exactly what the Soviets have offered? The ambassador was not willing or able to tell us.

NITZE: They haven't really offered. They're accepting an offer of ours. After all, it was the President's offer way back in '69.

DONALDSON: What are they accepting?

NITZE: The elimination of what we call LRINF, long-range INF missiles from Europe on both sides. They're going down in Europe to zero. They're accepting an offer that in the rest of the world there will be 100 warheads in Asia, and 100 warheads in the U.S.

DONALDSON: What about short-range missiles?

NITZE: There Mr. Shultz insisted that a solution to the problem would require that the levels be equal on both sides, and we've prepared to go to zero if they are prepared to go to equal level globally.

THIS WEEK WITH DAVID BRINKLEY (continued)

DONALDSON: What did they say?

NITZE: Mr. Gorbachev said yes. But Mr. Shultz made it clear... we would want to consult with our allies.

WILL: Is it not important...for us to insist that if indeed our 100 are to be in the U.S., that they be in Alaska?

NITZE: It's important for us not to give up the right to have them in Alaska, and we have not.

DONALDSON: The Soviets are now saying they want to have a test on our soil and we'll have a test on their soil...are we going to accept that?

NITZE: Yes, we are....

DONALDSON: Would it not be well for the President...to stipulate that for the foreseeable future the U.S. and NATO nations remain committed to an integrated form of conventional and nuclear forces?

NITZE: I think he may do that.

DONALDSON: When are we going to have a deal?

NITZE: ...I think all those things can be done in not more than another couple of weeks...then we'll be prepared to tell the Russians what is a firm alliance.

FREE-FOR-ALL DISCUSSION

HINCKLEY

BRINKLEY: Should John Hinckley Jr. have been let go home?

DONALDSON: I think we should follow the law.

MAYNARD: Why don't we apply the law of common sense?...

WILL: Once you have infused the law with psychology, then you have to have Hinckley on trial forever....

TRADE

BRINKLEY: The Japanese say the trade imbalance is our problem, not theirs -- so where do we go from here?

WILL:The answer has to be...for free trade.

MAYNARD: We're missing a very important element of the trade imbalance -- it has to do with the Third World. What needs to happen is a restructuring of their debt, a restructuring of their economies and an opening of their markets to the good and services that we export....

FACE THE NATION

MODERATOR: Lesley Stahl

GUESTS: Darrington D. Parker, U.S. District Court Judge; Joseph E. diGenova, U.S. attorney for the District of Columbia; William Carpenter, former psychiatrist for John Hinckley, Jr.; Professor Alan Dershowitz

STAHL: John Hinckley Jr., the young man who shot President Reagan, was found not guilty by reason of insanity. His doctors say he is now well enough to go home unescorted for a short visit; the government says he's not..... The verdict, not guilty by reason of insanity means that if Hinckley is declared cured, he must be released, despite the severity of his acts and despite public outcry.... I've heard people say about you, Judge, that it will be a cold day in hell when you release John Hinckley.

PARKER: You've seen comments that no doctor and no judge has the guts to do just that. But if the testimony supports it, certainly you must consider it. And the man was not found guilty of a crime. But I would be aware of the fact that the underlying crime for which he was not found guilty is assault, and that a person has been completely maimed for life. You can't help thinking that.

STAHL: Is there any reason you might think there was a cover-up, a deliberate cover-up, in this case?

diGENOVA: It is readily apparent from the fact that the hospital made the request on March 23rd, and then, on April 15th, after the hearing had started and testimony was given about the letter, it then withdrew its request for the release.

STAHL: It was revealed that the psychiatrist who testified on Hinckley's behalf was being paid by the Hinckley family.

diGENOVA: We were shocked when we discovered...the hospital revealed to us it had been the Hinckley family. That certainly raises questions for us and the NIMH which need to be looked into.

STAHL: Do you think Hinckley is being treated differently than the normal criminal mental patient because of the notoriety of his case?

DERSHOWITZ: Of course he's being treated differently.... The law is open-textured here. It leaves the psychiatrist tremendous discretion, it leaves the judge tremendous discretion and it leaves the U.S. Attorney tremendous discretion. This is a lawless area.

STAHL: Mr. diGenova, before you even knew about these letters to Ted Bundy, you were trying to prevent Hinckley from going home. On what grounds were you going to argue that he shouldn't be allowed to go home?

diGENOVA: Under law society made a contract with Mr. Hinckley. It says if you are guilty, you go to prison; if you are found not guilty by reason of insanity, you are indefinitely committed to a mental institution and then you get out when you can prove, by clear and convincing evidence, that you are no longer a danger to others....

STAHL: Do you think he should ever get out? diGENOVA: Absolutely not.

###

MEET THE PRESS

MODERATOR: Marvin Kalb PANEL: Anne Garrels, Robert Kaiser.
GUESTS: Speaker Jim Wright; Richard Perle, Assistant Secretary of Defense;
Georgi Arbatov, director of U.S.A. and Canada Institute of the Soviet
Union.

KALB: Do you feel that there's going to be a summit late this year and there will be a new arms control agreement signed?

ARBATOV: It looks more possible, but I'm tremendously cautious.... I would say there was never such a chance given to any President of the United States as now to have really important steps in our Soviet/American relations, including an end to arms race.

KAISER: There's a certain amount of confusion in Washington about the Soviet position. You seemed to have flip-flopped twice now in the last year.... Why is the Soviet decision bouncing back and forth?

ARBATOV: You put it in a very wrong way. I don't call it flip-flop; I call it real flexibility in an attempt to untie the knots. It opened the way for the agreement. The Americans made an opposite, real flip-flop. We accept their proposal and they say, "No, we need something else."...

GARRELS: You've now proposed zero shorter-range missiles. Are you willing to allow Europeans to match some of those short-range missiles and not have zero but at least a few?

ARBATOV: From the beginning it was your proposal.... Now they (Europeans) have a second thought.

GARRELS: What about that second thought?

ARBATOV: We don't have it on the table.... something will simply derail it. Why not do away with all of them? United States will have to create an absolutely new and very expensive weapons system in order to reach this ceiling. Soviet Union proposes to do away in a very short period, with all its short range missiles so that U.S. will not be in need of creating this new weapons system. What is unfair here? It's not arms control you proposal. It's lowering the ceiling of Soviet weapon and creating American weapons.... I think our position was reasonable.

GUEST: Rep. Jim Wright

KALB: You are quoted as saying that this is the best opportunity since WW II to make real peace between the two super powers? What you mean by real peace?

WRIGHT: I think peace is not just the absence of armed conflict, but a condition of understanding and an effort to accommodate the other.... I think there is a better chance (for an agreement) than there has been. We still have a long way to go. But I do discern a flexibility that hasn't been there before.

MEET THE PRESS (continued)

KAISER: Are you suggesting that there's been a fundamental change in the political culture of the Soviet Union?

WRIGHT: Oh no. I don't think we can say that the Soviet Union measures up to our standards of human rights. It surely doesn't. It never has. There's been some movement.... They're attempting to create a greater degree of flexibility at the local level and plant management. They have said that they released 1300 more people for immigration...in the first three months of this year than they did in the first three months of last year. All that's movement in the right direction, but it's like looking at a glacier. Any movement at all is significant.

GARRELS: Are you not concerned with all the enthusiasm for an agreement that the pressure might be such that the U.S. will agree to an arms control agreement that is less than adequate?

WRIGHT: I think there are people who do not want an arms control agreement.... But we've reached a point where it's to our advantage to get a legitimate arms control agreement....

KAISER: Some people seem to have the impression that Gorbachev is sort of desperate to help Ronald Reagan, that he keeps changing his position to help Reagan when he's down. What's your reading on Gorbachev's motivation?

WRIGHT: I don't think it's a personal matter. I think he's trying to move the peace process forward....

KALB: What are the major roadblocks toward an agreement that would bring down to zero medium-range and even smaller short-range?

WRIGHT: I'm not sure there are major roadblocks. I think it depends upon the agreement if our Western allies....

GUEST: RICHARD PERLE

KALB: What are the obstacles you see toward reaching this kind of medium-range agreement with the Soviet Union?

PERLE: There are some issues we haven't closed on yet. One of them is verification.... We have to settle this question of how to treat shorter-range missiles....

KAISER: Why is this proposal that's on the table more acceptable to you than many of the predecessors that you've criticized?

PERLE: This proposal to eliminate medium-range missiles is one that this Administration has supported from the very beginning. The Soviets now make it appear as though it's a Soviet initiative. It was Ronald Reagan's initiative and it took a lot of people by surprise.... I think what has been demonstrated is that with perseverance and persistence, the Soviets can be brought to change their position.

MEET THE PRESS (continued)

KAISER: Will this agreement redeem the Reagan Administration policies in this field; after eight years the only thing you've done is restore a kind of pre-1965 balance in Europe? Is that a big accomplishment?

PERLE: I would happily contrast the Reagan Administration to our national security with previous administrations who permitted our defenses to deteriorate... I think we have a very solid record of accomplishment.

GARRELS: Is this just a political victory or does this really mean anything for arms control?

PERLE: It makes a difference. It has to be seen in conjunction with other proposals, including the American proposal to reduce by 50 percent the number of strategic weapons.

GARRELS: But those proposals went nowhere during your talks in Moscow.

PERLE: I think it's clear the Soviets did not want seriously to discuss the 50 percent reductions and that ought to make us cautious. This isn't the millennium. And we're not going to save vast sums of money by eliminating intermediate nuclear weapons in Europe....In order to provide more effective conventional military capability we may have to spend more rather than less to maintain a reasonable level of security there.

KALB: Did Mr. Gorbachev present any new definition of what acceptable research might be on strategic defense.

PERLE: They have offered a number of definitions that all have the same very dangerous bottom line. It would prevent the U.S. from continuing with the program of research and development and strategic defense.... They support all forms of defense except our program. And, so, we would be compelled to terminate our SDI system.

KAISER: Are you really saying that they're making proposals that would allow them to continue and us not to continue?

PERLE: Absolutely, because the proposals they're making are utterly unverifiable. We wouldn't know whether they were complying or not....

GARRELS: What about nuclear testing?

PERLE: Well, if each of us tested one weapon...it's not adequate. It's a first step. In order to get real verification, we need to be able to send teams to the Soviet Union and they have to send teams to the United States.... That's the American proposal. If there is anything real to the Soviet notion of openness, they ought to accept that proposal, because there is no way it would do them any harm and it would give confidence....

KAISER. On a scale of one to ten, what are the odds of a summit and a deal in the next year?

PERLE: I would think the odds are quite good for a summit, provided we settle this issue of verifications and provided we get a satisfactory solution to the short-range missile problem.

MCLAUGHLIN GROUP

MODERATOR: John McLaughlin. PANEL: Carl Leusbendorf, Robert Novak, Jack Germond, Morton Kondracke.

ARMS AGREEMENT

MCLAUGHLIN: What does this add up to?

LEUBSDORF: What's happen is that Secretary Gorbachev has called President Reagan's bluff on this. He's going to get the agreement he wants.

NOVAK: The Soviets are playing us like a cheap accordion. The Administration is trapped. Everyone is so desperate to get some agreement, some kind of summit, that they are on the verge of agreeing to as nuclear-free Europe. What's next? The Pacific? I think they have to take a look at the long-range consequences.

GERMOND: The immediate response of any sane person, would be encouraged by the prospect of a sharp reduction of nuclear arms. But I am also concerned about the way and pace at which this is done. I'm also concerned about what is driving the Administration and the competence of this Administration and their ability to do a treaty that we can be safe with.

KONDRACKE: We're now stuffing down the throats of the Europeans the notion that all short-range nuclear missiles have got to be gotten rid of. Now, we want this deal so badly, we're going to make the Europeans give up that protection.

MCLAUGHLIN: The White House is concerned about the NATO allies.... Should the U.S. go forward with a Soviet deal that does include conventional force reduction?

LEUBSDORF: They probably shouldn't, but they probably will.

GERMOND: It isn't necessarily a question of conventional force reduction, it's a question of conventional force parody -- whether you can achieve that. One of the things they need to look at it taking a longer period to do this nuclear weapon reduction to allow for that conventional force parody.

NOVAK: A lot of the Democrats have been saying what we have to do is have a conventional deterrent....

KONDRACKE: If the Soviet tried a conventional invasion of Western Europe, we would be able to stop them with tactical nuclear weapons.... The balance that Shultz is going to try to force on the Europeans that the Soviets would have short-range missiles able to hit targets in West Germany. We are going to have a very short-range missiles which could be captured. So the Germans are going to be scared to death about this.

NOVAK: The danger is that you end up firing a strategic weapon for a submarine and therefore you have a worldwide nuclear conflict. You don't have the flexible response. And what we're all worried about is this mad rush for a summit...

MCLAUGHLIN GROUP continued:

MCLAUGHLIN : Give me the year and the month that nuclear weapons, when all the other nuclear weapons will be outside of Europe.

LEUBSDORF: Not in our lifetime. NOVAK: A couple of years.

GERMOND: At least two years, certainly not in Reagan's term.

KONDRACKE: By the end of Reagan's term. MCLAUGHLIN: I agree with Morton.

TRADE DEFICIT:

MCLAUGHLIN: Is Baker bombing as Treasury Secretary?

GERMOND: We don't know yet.... He's obviously in some trouble on this thing right now. Everyone knew this was a possibility.

NOVAK: What Secretary Baker tried to do -- a balancing act -- he was trying to put a floor on the dollar and not say he was doing it for fear on getting Congress all riled-up.... The trade deficit is absolutely meaningless...and what Jim Baker did this week is something he should have done a long time ago -- he firmed-up the dollar by saying that there is a floor. The real question is what is the FED going to do?

KONDRACKE: This is just garbage.... If Jim Baker had his way I think you would have a grand deal whereby you cut the deficit by having a tax increase and by limiting entitlements. Baker is not going to propose that.

LEUBSDORF; That's exactly the problem and until the President excepts some kind of deal like this, that problem isn't going to be solved....

MCLAUGHLIN: I want to know whether now is the time to head to the fire exit as far as stocks and bonds are concerned -- to get out - to sell.

LEUBSDORF: For the long term, probably no.

NOVAK: We've got better things ahead. GERMOND: I don't know.

KONDRACKE: I agree with Carl. MCLAUGHLIN: Carl & Mort are correct.

PREDICTIONS

LEUBSDORF: When Congress begins Iran hearing, the first witness will be former National Security Advisor Robert McFarlane.

NOVAK: The Marine Embassy scandal has not reached it's peak yet.

GERMOND: These Democrats on the second tier will begin attacking Hart, trying to draw him into a confrontation.

KONDRACKE: Watch out for a write-in campaign - Howard Baker for President.

MCLAUGHLIN: Paul Volcker will be reappointed to a third term.

AGRONSKY & COMPANY

MODERATOR: Martin Agronsky. PANEL: James J. Kilpatrick Jr., Carl Rowan, Tom Oliphant, Hugh Sidney.

FCC RULING

AGRONSKY: The FCC warns stations which permit such dirty language -- face fines, criminal prosecution or even loss of their broadcast licenses. Is the FCC right to do this?

KILPATRICK: I really am of two minds on this ruling -- this is ugly stuff on the air, civilized society ought not to have to tolerate it, a certain number of people who would be offended by it in the few second it would take to turn off the set, but I'm awfully concerned about giving the government agency the power to say, in this way, what is indecent.

ROWAN: I'm in agreement.

OLIPHANT: What I think we see here is an Administration caught in a vice in terms of its being in the control of special interest groups. On the one hand, the job is to regulate broadcasting in the public interest. Well, the corporations don't want to do that, so the Reagan Administration tries deregulation. On the other hand, right wing extremists hollow for censorship of dirty words -- they jump in and try to do that. It's inherently contradictory policy.

SIDNEY: The fact of the matter is that the government doles out these licenses. The government is the one who decided. It's a quasi-public utility, so therefore, I think there must be or there is reason for some standards. There are community standards. There are standards of decency. I think excess inevitably breeds another regulation.... It seems to me it was necessary for the government to make some statement on this since they give the licenses.

AGRONSKY: I cannot forget the words of Justice Black -- any law that has bridged the first amendment -- and Black always said no law means no law.

U.S./SOVIET RELATIONS

AGRONSKY: Hugh, both (the President and Secretary Shultz) seemed agreed there is a real prospect -- we can come to an agreement to removal intermediate nuclear missiles from Europe and we may be able to go forward with a Russian proposal to remove short-range nuclear missiles from Europe. You were at a meeting with General Scowcroft...where are you on this?

SIDNEY: He (General Scowcroft) is disturbed by it. The irony here is the political cross-currents that have come on. Many people have argued strongly against Reagan for not having some agreement in his six years on the job, condemned him. And now, suddenly, some portion of that group has come around and said. "Look -- this is the wrong agreement." And Scowcroft understands that. He says that for 40 years we have what is known as the flexible response.... He sees this process beginning to get a nuclear-free Europe, which he thinks raises the possibility of super power exchange of nuclear weapon.

AGRONSKY & COMPANY (continued)

OLIPHANT: Obviously we can get rid of the short-range nuclear weapons. But even if you do that, there are still hundreds of these so-called tactical battlefield nuclear weapons. Also, the short-range missiles are only in the hands of the Soviet Union. We don't have any.

SIDNEY: His point is that that's the next step. He says what this does is opens up to a very clever maneuver, Mr. Gorbachev, to say, altogether, let's get rid of the tactical weapons. And Scowcroft says one other thing interesting too. He says he thinks the politics behind this make is inevitable. We're going to get this whether he likes it or not. And Europe -- they're very disturbed by it.

ROWAN: Well, we may get it but I don't think it will come as easily as the headlines of today look.... And there's still a lot of people in this government who don't want any arms agreement.

AGRONSKY: The Secretary of State himself was asked by reporters who suggested that the Soviet proposal on medium-range missiles had put the United States in a box.... If we've been placed in a box -- it's a wonderful box to be in. We've been working from day one to bring about radical reduction of these weapons and we're moving toward achievement.

KILPATRICK: I think you must maintain some nuclear deterrent in Europe....

OLIPHANT: I think we must take some of the concerns of our NATO allies with a grain of salt. Part of what they are really saying is that they would like to have more of a nuclear deterrent because they don't want to spend very much on conventional weapons.

ROWAN: ...It may well be that his (the President's) best place in history will be that he cut a deal with the evil empire on the missiles business.

SIDNEY: ...The fact of the matter is if the Soviets keep their conventional forces that we ought to make part of this agreement that we negotiate reductions of conventional forces.

TARIFFS

AGRONSKY: The President consistently opposed high tariffs and protectionism feeling in the end it would hurt this country, but now he's yielded. Was he wise to do that?

OLIPHANT: No, he was foolish.... This is the most protectionist American President since WWII. The road the President has taken this country down leads only to higher interest rates, recession.

KILPATRICK: Nonsense. This had to be done. The Japanese brought it on themselves. This may be the one thing that motivates that Japanese finally to do the things they should have done years ago.

SIDNEY: I don't understand Tom's definition of him as a protectionist President. He has fought this all the way, but he's had to light backfires...or else we would have gotten overwhelmingly bad legislation.

-End of News Summary-