

Ronald Reagan Presidential Library
Digital Library Collections

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

Collection: Linhard, Robert E.: Files, 1982-1988
SERIES I: ARMS CONTROL CHRONOLOGICAL FILE
Folder Title: Geneva Summit Records
11/19/1985-11/21/1985 (4 of 4)
Box: RAC Box 7

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/>

WITHDRAWAL SHEET

Ronald Reagan Library

DOCUMENT NO. AND TYPE	SUBJECT/TITLE	DATE	RESTRICTION
1. memcon	forth plenary meeting (7pp)	11/20/85	P-1
	<i>BR, NLS F96-087 5/15/00 #1</i>		
2. memcon	afternoon meeting at Soviet Mission, Geneva (13pp)	11/20/85	P-1
	<i>" " #2</i>		
3. memcon	Mrs. Gorbachev's tea for Mrs. Reagan (2pp)	11/20/85	P-1
	<i>" " #3</i>		
4. memcon	dinner hosted by the President and Mrs. Reagan (7pp)	11/20/85	P-1
	<i>" " #4</i>		
5. memcon	summary of President's NATO consultations (14pp)	11/21/85	P-1
	<i>" " #5</i>		
COLLECTION: LINHARD, ROBERT E.: Files			ggc
FILE FOLDER: Geneva Summit Records, Nov. 19-21, 1985 [4 of 4] <i>GA-92178 RE-3 Nov 7</i>			11/6/95

RESTRICTION CODES

Presidential Records Act - [44 U.S.C. 2204(a)]

- P-1 National security classified information [(a)(1) of the PRA].
- P-2 Relating to appointment to Federal office [(a)(2) of the PRA].
- P-3 Release would violate a Federal statute [(a)(3) of the PRA].
- P-4 Release would disclose trade secrets or confidential commercial or financial information [(a)(4) of the PRA].
- P-5 Release would disclose confidential advice between the President and his advisors, or between such advisors [(a)(5) of the PRA].
- P-6 Release would constitute a clearly unwarranted invasion of personal privacy [(a)(6) of the PRA].

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

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

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

MEMORANDUM OF CONVERSATION

REAGAN-GORBACHEV MEETINGS IN GENEVA
November, 1985

Fourth Plenary Meeting

DATE: November 20, 1985
TIME: 2:45 P. M. - 3:30 P.M.
PLACE: Soviet Mission,
Geneva, Switzerland

PARTICIPANTS:

United States

President Ronald Reagan
George Shultz, Secretary of State
Donald T. Regan, Chief of Staff, White House
Robert C. McFarlane, Assistant to the President for National
Security Affairs
Arthur Hartman, Ambassador to the USSR
Paul H. Nitze, Special Advisor to the President and Secretary of
State on Arms Control Matters
Jack F. Matlock, Jr., Special Assistant to the President for
National Security Affairs
Mark Parris, Director, Office of Soviet Union Affairs, Department
of State
Dimitri Tarechnak, Interpreter

Union of Soviet Socialist Republics

General Secretary Mikhail Gorbachev
Eduard Shevardnadze, Minister of Foreign Affairs
Georgy M. Korniyenko, First Deputy Minister of Foreign Affairs
Anatoly F. Dobrynin, Ambassador to the United States
Aleksandr Yakovlev, Chief, Propaganda Department, Central
Committee, CPSU
Leonid M. Zamyatin, Chief, International Information Department,
Central Committee, CPSU
Andrey M. Aleksandrov-Agentov, Assistant to General Secretary
Gorbachev
Sergey P. Tarasenko, Assistant to Minister of Foreign Affairs
Soviet Interpreter

~~SECRET/SENSITIVE~~
Declassify: OADR

DECLASSIFIED
NLS F96-067 #1
BY dlb, NARA, DATE 5/15/00

Gorbachev opened the meeting by remarking that just days before the two leaders had been moving toward Geneva. They were now moving toward the completion of their meeting. Gorbachev understood that this would be their last official session. He invited the President to start the session.

The President began by noting that he would like to summarize his discussions with Gorbachev over the previous two days. He had a few points to make and would be interested in seeing if Gorbachev could agree.

There had been two days of candid conversation on a wide range of issues. There were clear differences on such questions as nuclear weapons, on the political philosophy of the two countries. It was important to be realistic and to have no illusions regarding our differences.

But there were some common concerns as well. Both sides had expressed their commitment to deep reductions in nuclear armaments and their hope to eliminate such weapons entirely some day. Both would like to intensify discussions on how to increase strategic stability and reduce the dangers to either side.

The President repeated his conviction of a need for a shift from deterrence based on strategic arms to a greater reliance on defensive systems. If our research was borne out it would be necessary to discuss how to introduce defensive systems. There was also a need for greater mutual trust through compliance with obligations under bilateral and multilateral agreements from arms control to the Helsinki Final Act.

In addition to creating a safer strategic environment, it was necessary to end tragic regional conflicts. The two sides differed on the causes of regional tensions, but the President believed both saw the need to intensify the consultative process on local conflicts. As he had said in his October UNGA speech, the United States was prepared to associate itself with bold initiatives to resolve conflicts which had damaged U.S.-Soviet relations and aggravated international tensions. This was behind our proposals for military disengagement and to end outside involvement in regional struggles. The people of the various regions must be able to solve their own problems.

There were a number of bilateral questions which could be resolved if the necessary political will was there. The two sides should be able to agree to a fundamental expansion of exchanges in the areas of culture, science, and athletics as a means of promoting greater mutual understanding.

The President described his discussions with Gorbachev as rich and constructive. He was pleased that the two leaders would

continue the process by visiting each others' countries. He looked forward to the pleasure of Gorbachev's visit to the U.S. in 1986, and to his own visit to Moscow in 1987. The results of the Geneva meetings would be clear only in the months and years ahead.

The President then read the following statement on the Nuclear and Space Talks (NST) for the Soviets' consideration as a joint statement of what might be accomplished in those discussions:

"The President and the General Secretary discussed the negotiations on nuclear and space arms. They agreed that work on these negotiations should be accelerated with a view to accomplishing the tasks assigned in the Joint US-Soviet Agreement of January 8, 1985, specifically to prevent an arms race in outer space and to terminate it on earth, to limit and reduce nuclear arms and enhance strategic stability. Offensive nuclear arms will be significantly reduced applying the general concept of 50% reductions to equal ceilings on specific, comparable categories. There will be a separate interim agreement resulting in reductions and limitations on land-based, intermediate-range nuclear missile systems as a step toward the total elimination of this class of missiles. To insure effective verification of compliance, meaningful measures to this end will be negotiated concurrently with limits on weaponry and incorporated in all agreements resulting from these negotiations."

After first confirming that the President was finished, Gorbachev indicated that he would like to sum up the meeting from the Soviet perspective.

Gorbachev felt that the very fact of the meeting should be considered a positive development, since it demonstrated a joint understanding of the significance of U.S.-Soviet relations and of the two sides' responsibilities and role in the world. He agreed with the President that the meeting had taken place in an atmosphere of frankness, which permitted the two leaders to outline in detail their positions on the full range of bilateral and international questions.

Gorbachev concurred further that the discussions had revealed deep differences in the two sides' assessments of the causes of certain bilateral and international differences. The talks had allowed both sides to understand one another better; this was of some importance, even major importance. Gorbachev felt, however, that the discussion had shown that the two sides were unable to build a joint concept for dealing with the broad range of bilateral and international questions. Nonetheless, they had agreed to continue their political dialogue. It was in this context that the two leaders had agreed on an exchange of visits at a time to be arranged.

~~SECRET/SENSITIVE~~

For its part the Soviet side would have to say in describing the meeting that questions of war and peace had been at the center of the meeting in one way or another both during private discussions and in plenary sessions. He felt that the people of both countries, as well as the world as a whole, were concerned by the number of nuclear weapons and the need to stop the arms race and to proceed to disarmament. Unfortunately, it was impossible to report to our peoples and to the world that there had been a rapprochement of positions.

The Soviet side had tried in the meetings to make an extra effort to explain its views. Discussions had been held, but it would be a distortion of the truth to say that there had been progress. Such progress as had been achieved was limited to a detailed discussion and exchange of positions. Gorbachev hoped that this was not the last word. Both sides would take into account the frank discussions which had taken place. Joint efforts should be continued.

The Soviet Union was in favor of continuing negotiations on the basis of the January 1985 Joint Statement on stopping the arms race on earth and preventing it in space. Serious work lay ahead. Gorbachev felt that movement was possible. The Soviet Union was committed to the spirit of the January 1985 understandings and prepared to act in accord with them, on the clear understanding that it was against the arms race on earth. The USSR was prepared as a first step to seek to implement the idea of a 50% reduction of offensive nuclear forces on the basis of both sides' proposals. But this was based on the understanding that neither side would take steps which would open up an arms race in space. On the basis of this understanding the Soviet Union was open to further movement toward deep reductions in nuclear arms.

Gorbachev agreed that it was possible to intensify bilateral relations. This would contribute to greater trust between the two countries. The USSR would be ready to work to expand exchanges in the economic, cultural and scientific fields.

On regional problems (which he at first forgot to mention), Gorbachev acknowledged that both sides attached importance to the problem and shared a desire to seek political settlements of regional disputes to relieve tensions on the basis of non-interference in the internal affairs of other countries. He agreed that bilateral regional expert consultations should be continued.

Noting that the President had raised the possibility of a statement summarizing the results of their discussions, Gorbachev asked if this would be justified. The President indicated that we had hoped to get to the subject, and called on Secretary Shultz to outline the options as we saw them. Gorbachev commented that the Soviets did not insist that there be a statement. If there

was nothing to report, it was better to say so. The President felt nonetheless that it would be useful to share views or try to handle the question of reporting the results of their meetings.

Secretary Shultz outlined a number of options, noting that one could envision an outcome involving all, some, or none.

-- First, there could be a written compilation of all items which had been agreed during the leaders' meetings or in the preparations for their meetings. There were quite a number of these, of varying importance. There was a possibility of developing joint language on certain arms control questions: e.g., on the Stockholm conference and chemical weapons proliferation. Agreed language existed on nuclear non-proliferation. The President in the statement he read had raised the possibility that NST might be treated, although that morning's conversation had shown the depth of differences on that set of issues. There could also be agreement on a range of regional and bilateral questions, and on a process for the future. In this connection the Secretary had been struck by Gorbachev's references the day before to a mechanism for regulating U.S.-Soviet relations. Thus, it might prove feasible to develop a package which would register areas of agreement reached in Geneva. Disagreements would not be registered except to acknowledge that they existed.

-- A second possibility would be to sign some sort of document. The general exchanges agreement was already agreed at the technical level and could be signed if the leaders wished.

-- A third element would be separate statements by leaders at a common site. While each leader would say what he wished, the U.S. felt there should be some coordination to avoid surprises. The Secretary speculated that statements could refer to differences but could also include parallel language where appropriate. For example, on NST there were issues on which U.S. and Soviet views coincided, and others where they did not. The kind of statement he had in mind would make clear both areas of agreement and disagreement.

- A fourth option would be to release a short joint report saying, essentially, that the leaders had met and agreed to meet again. Both sides could then issue statements of their own.

- Finally, the two sides could make individual statements at different sites. The Secretary speculated that both leaders would, in any case, be reporting publicly to their peoples in their meetings.

The Secretary concluded by noting that the U.S. would be willing to consider some sort of joint ceremony on the next morning, but was prepared to go in a variety of ways. He was aware of the

~~SECRET/SENSITIVE~~

great responsibility each leader had before their own people and the world to report on their discussions. A dignified ceremony at which areas of agreement could be reported and differences laid out in a modulated fashion would seem to be an appropriate way to proceed. In such a context, the President's statement on NST could be either included in a joint statement or used unilaterally.

Gorbachev, noting that the issue required some thought, indicated that he was nonetheless prepared to respond. If he understood correctly, both sides wanted to continue the dialogue that was begun in preparations for the Geneva meeting, which had been expanded in Geneva, and which would be continued in the future. Even if one were subjectively against such dialogue, objectively it was necessary to continue contacts and exchanges, and to deepen the process of searching for solutions in the interests of U.S. and Soviet peoples and of the people of the whole world. The Soviet Union, therefore, welcomed Secretary Shultz's expression of willingness to continue work in the future.

On how to document the Geneva meeting, Gorbachev indicated that the Soviet Union would be prepared to accommodate a U.S. desire for a joint document, whether a communique or simple statement. Noting that the Soviet Union had originally advocated a communique, but had dropped the idea when it appeared the U.S. was not interested, he outlined his assessment of how to proceed. If a communique incorporated the fundamental results of the meeting, there would be no need for separate statements. If such a communique were impossible, the Geneva program should end with the present meeting.

Gorbachev felt that it would be inappropriate to seek simply to list minor agreements in a joint document. This would not be understood in our two countries or internationally. A more substantive statement would be necessary. Gorbachev wondered whether the two leaders should reassess the problem and perhaps deputize senior members of their staffs to propose a solution. He joked that he and the President might take a walk, leaving Secretary Shultz and Foreign Minister Shevardnadze to work on the problem.

More seriously, Gorbachev recalled that the Soviets had always been prepared for a communique; indeed at one point they had thought the U.S. had agreed to such a document. He felt that there was still time to work out an acceptable document if both sides were willing. He repeated his suggestion that the Foreign Ministers should study the problem and present their findings to the leaders.

The President observed that he might have been to blame for any confusion the Soviets had felt with respect to a communique. In considering the question before the Geneva meeting, the

SECRET/SENSITIVE

President had been concerned about how a prearranged communiqué might be perceived. He had been similarly uncomfortable early in his presidency with the practice at the OECD summit meeting of having one leader read a pre-cooked document on behalf of the others. His concern for Geneva was that a document emphasize that the meeting was part of an ongoing process. In this context, a document might be worthwhile. The President felt, however, that such a document should include bilateral issues already worked out.

Gorbachev said he shared the President's view. After seven years without a U.S.-Soviet summit, the President was probably right in being somewhat apprehensive about how the meeting would develop. Now that the meeting had taken place, it might be possible to compile "a joint approach in a fundamental way." Gorbachev again suggested that the Secretary and Shevardnadze consult and report to the leaders.

The Secretary commented that U.S. and Soviet representatives had been at work since 11:30 that morning to explore possibilities of developing acceptable joint language. It would be necessary to check with them before he and Shevardnadze could begin work. Gorbachev agreed. He proposed a break and quipped that the most important task facing the Foreign Ministers now was to find their subordinates.

Secretary Shultz confessed jokingly that he and Shevardnadze had agreed in a September dinner conversation that they should let their leaders carry as much of the burden in Geneva as possible. Until Gorbachev had given the Foreign Ministers their current assignment, they thought they had succeeded. Gorbachev suggested that the Secretary was simply trying to turn his joke about a walk around on him. The Secretary told him not to worry, that he (the Secretary) had a thick skin.

The President and Gorbachev agreed to adjourn the meeting and, after a ten minute conversation in the Mission reception room, retired to a separate area for an extended private conversation.

Prepared by:
Mark Parris,
Department of State

Meeting Date: 20 November 1985
Time: 2:45 P.M. - 3:30 P.M.
Place: Soviet Mission, Geneva

Participants:

U.S.	USSR
President Ronald Reagan	General Secretary Gorbachev
Secretary Shultz	Foreign Minister Shevardnadze
Donald Regan	Amb. A. Dobrynin
Robert McFarlane	Dep. Foreign Minister Korniyenko
Amb. Arthur Hartman	CPSU CC Dept. Chief Yakovlev
Amb. Paul Nitze	CPSU CC Dept. Chief Zamyatin
Amb. Jack Matlock	Sergei Tarasenko (Notetaker)
Mark Parris (Notetaker)	Soviet Interpreter
Dimitry Zarechnak (Int.)	Soviet Interpreter

Gorbachev opened the meeting by remarking that just days before the two leaders had been moving toward Geneva. They were now moving toward the completion of their meeting. Gorbachev understood that this would be their last official session. He invited the President to start the session.

The President began by noting that he would like to summarize his discussions with Gorbachev over the previous two days. He had

a few points to make and would be interested in seeing if Gorbachev could agree.

There had been two days of candid conversation on a wide range of issues. There were clear differences on such questions as nuclear weapons, on the political philosophy of the two countries. It was important to be realistic and to have no illusions regarding our differences.

But there were some common concerns as well. Both sides had expressed their commitment to deep reductions in nuclear armaments and their hope to eliminate such weapons entirely some day. Both would like to intensify discussions on how to increase strategic stability and reduce the dangers to either side.

The President repeated his conviction of a need for a shift from deterrence based on strategic arms to a greater reliance on defensive systems. If our research was borne out it would be necessary to discuss how to introduce defensive systems. There was also a need for greater mutual trust through compliance with obligations under bilateral and multilateral agreements from arms control to the Helsinki Final Act.

In addition to creating a safer strategic environment, it was necessary to end tragic regional conflicts. The two sides differed on the causes of regional tensions, but the President believed both saw the need to intensify the consultative process on local conflicts. As he had said in his October UNGA speech, the United States was prepared to associate itself with bold initiatives to resolve conflicts which had damaged U.S.-Soviet relations and aggravated international tensions. This was behind our proposals for military disengagement and to end outside involvement in regional struggles. The people of the various regions must be able to solve their own problems.

There were a number of bilateral questions which could be resolved if the necessary political will was there. The two sides should be able to agree to a fundamental expansion of exchanges in the areas of culture, science, and athletics as a means of promoting greater mutual understanding.

The President described his discussions with Gorbachev as rich and constructive. He was pleased that the two leaders would continue the process by visiting each others' countries. He looked forward to the pleasure of Gorbachev's visit to the U.S. in 1986, and to his own visit to Moscow in 1987. The results of the Geneva meetings would be clear only in the months and years ahead.

The President then read the following statement on the Nuclear and Space Talks (NST) for the Soviets' consideration as a joint statement of what might be accomplished in those discussions:

"The President and the General Secretary discussed the negotiations on nuclear and space arms. They agreed that work on these negotiations should be accelerated with a view to accomplishing the tasks assigned in the Joint US-Soviet Agreement of January 8, 1985, specifically to prevent an arms race in outer space and to terminate it on earth, to limit and reduce nuclear arms and enhance strategic stability. Offensive nuclear arms will be significantly reduced applying the general concept of 50% reductions to equal ceilings on specific, comparable categories. There will be a separate interim agreement resulting in reductions and limitations on land-based, intermediate-range nuclear missile systems as a step toward the total elimination of this class of missiles. To insure effective verification of compliance, meaningful measures to this end will be negotiated concurrently with limits on weaponry and incorporated in all agreements resulting from these negotiations."

After first confirming that the President was finished, Gorbachev indicated that he would like to sum up the meeting from the Soviet perspective.

Gorbachev felt that the very fact of the meeting should be considered a positive development, since it demonstrated a joint understanding of the significance of U.S. - Soviet relations and of the two sides' responsibilities and role in the world. He agreed with the President that the meeting had taken place in an atmosphere of frankness, which permitted the two leaders to outline in detail their positions on the full range of bilateral and international questions.

Gorbachev concurred further that the discussions had revealed deep differences in the two sides' assessments of the causes of certain bilateral and international differences. The talks had allowed both sides to understand one another better; this was of some importance, even major importance. Gorbachev felt, however, that the discussion had shown that the two sides were unable to build a joint concept for dealing with the broad range of bilateral and international questions. Nonetheless, they had agreed to continue their political dialogue. It was in this context that the two leaders had agreed on an exchange of visits at a time to be arranged.

For its part the Soviet side would have to say in describing the meeting that questions of war and peace had been at the center of the meeting in one way or another both during private discussions and in plenary sessions. He felt that the people of both countries, as well as the world as a whole, were concerned by the number of nuclear weapons and the need to stop the arms race and to proceed to disarmament. Unfortunately, it was impossible to report to our peoples and to the world that there had been a rapprochement of positions.

The Soviet side had tried in the meetings to make an extra effort to explain its views. Discussions had been held, but it would be a distortion of the truth to say that there had been progress. Such progress as had been achieved was limited to a detailed discussion and exchange of positions. Gorbachev hoped that this was not the last word. Both sides would take into account the frank discussions which had taken place. Joint efforts should be continued.

The Soviet Union was in favor of continuing negotiations on the basis of the January 1985 Joint Statement on stopping the arms race on earth and preventing it in space. Serious work lay ahead. Gorbachev felt that movement was possible. The Soviet Union was committed to the spirit of the January 1985

understandings and prepared to act in accord with them, on the clear understanding that it was against the arms race on earth. The USSR was prepared as a first step to seek to implement the idea of a 50% reduction of offensive nuclear forces on the basis of both sides' proposals. But this was based on the understanding that neither side would take steps which would open up an arms race in space. On the basis of this understanding the Soviet Union was open to further movement toward deep reductions in nuclear arms.

Gorbachev agreed that it was possible to intensify bilateral relations. This would contribute to greater trust between the two countries. The USSR would be ready to work to expand exchanges in the economic, cultural and scientific fields.

On regional problems (which he at first forgot to mention), Gorbachev acknowledged that both sides attached importance to the problem and shared a desire to seek political settlements of regional disputes to relieve tensions on the basis of non-interference in the internal affairs of other countries. He agreed that bilateral regional expert consultations should be continued.

Noting that the President had raised the possibility of a

statement summarizing the results of their discussions, Gorbachev asked if this would be justified. The President indicated that we had hoped to get to the subject, and called on Secretary Shultz to outline the options as we saw them. Gorbachev commented that the Soviets did not insist that there be a statement. If there was nothing to report, it was better to say so. The President felt nonetheless that it would be useful to share views on how to handle the question of reporting the results of their meetings.

Secretary Shultz outlined a number of options, noting that one could envision an outcome involving all, some, or none.

- First, there could be a written compilation of all items which had been agreed during the leaders' meetings or in the preparations for their meetings. There were quite a number of these, of varying importance. There was a possibility of developing joint language on certain arms control questions: e.g., on the Stockholm conference and chemical weapons proliferation. Agreed language existed on nuclear non-proliferation. The President in the statement he read had raised the possibility that NST might be treated, although that morning's conversation had shown the depth of differences on that set of issues. There could also be agreement on a range of regional and bilateral questions, and on a process for the

future. In this connection the Secretary had been struck by Gorbachev's references the day before to a mechanism for regulating US-Soviet relations. Thus, it might prove feasible to develop a package which would register areas of agreement reached in Geneva. Disagreements would not be registered except to acknowledge that they existed.

- A second possibility would be to sign some sort of document. The general exchanges agreement was already agreed at the technical level and could be signed if the leaders wished.

- A third element would be separate statements by leaders at a common site. While each leader would say what he wished, the U.S. felt there should be some coordination to avoid surprises. The Secretary speculated that statements could refer to differences but could also include parallel language where appropriate. For example, on NST there were issues on which U.S. and Soviet views coincided, and others where they did not. The kind of statement he had in mind would make clear both areas of agreement and disagreement.

- A fourth option would be to release a short joint report saying, essentially, that the leaders had met and agreed to meet again. Both sides could then issue statements of their own.

- Finally, the two sides could make individual statements at different sites. The Secretary speculated that both leaders would, in any case, be reporting publicly to their peoples on their meetings.

The Secretary concluded by noting that the U.S. would be willing to consider some sort of joint ceremony on the next morning, but was prepared to go in a variety of ways. He was aware of the great responsibility each leader had before their own people and the world to report on their discussions. A dignified ceremony at which areas of agreement could be reported and differences laid out in a modulated fashion would seem to be an appropriate way to proceed. In such a context, the President's statement on NST could be either included in a joint statement or used unilaterally.

Gorbachev, noting that the issue required some thought, indicated that he was nonetheless prepared to respond. If he understood correctly, both sides wanted to continue the dialogue that was begun in preparations for the Geneva meeting, which had been expanded in Geneva, and which would be continued in the future. Even if one were subjectively against such dialogue, objectively it was necessary to continue contacts and exchanges, and to deepen the process of searching for solutions

in the interests of U.S. and Soviet peoples and of the people of the whole world. The Soviet Union, therefore, welcomed Secretary Shultz's expression of willingness to continue work in the future.

On how to document the Geneva meeting, Gorbachev indicated that the Soviet Union would be prepared to accommodate a U.S. desire for a joint document, whether a communique or simple statement. Noting that the Soviet Union had originally advocated a communique, but had dropped the idea when it appeared the U.S. was not interested, he outlined his assessment of how to proceed. If a communique incorporated the fundamental results of the meeting, there would be no need for separate statements. If such a communique were impossible, the Geneva program should end with the present meeting.

Gorbachev felt that it would be inappropriate to seek simply to list minor agreements in a joint document. This would not be understood in our two countries or internationally. A more substantive statement would be necessary. Gorbachev wondered whether the two leaders should reassess the problem and perhaps deputize senior members of their staffs to propose a solution. He joked that he and the President might take a walk, leaving Secretary Shultz and Foreign Minister Shevardnadze to work on the problem.

More seriously, Gorbachev recalled that the Soviets had always been prepared for a communique; indeed at one point they had thought the U.S. had agreed to such a document. He felt that there was still time to work out an acceptable document if both sides were willing. He repeated his suggestion that the Foreign Ministers should study the problem and present their findings to the leaders.

The President observed that he might have been to blame for any confusion the Soviets had felt with respect to a communique. In considering the question before the Geneva meeting, the President had been concerned about how a prearranged communique might be perceived. He had been similarly uncomfortable early in his presidency with the practice at the OECD summit meeting of having one leader read a pre-cooked document on behalf of the others. His concern for Geneva was that a document emphasize that the meeting was part of an ongoing process. In this context, a document might be worthwhile. The President felt, however, that such a document should include bilateral issues already worked out.

Gorbachev said he shared the President's view. After seven years without a U.S.-Soviet summit, the President was probably right in being somewhat apprehensive about how the meeting

would develop. Now that the meeting had taken place, it might be possible to compile "a joint approach in a fundamental way." Gorbachev again suggested that the Secretary and Shevardnadze consult and report to the leaders.

The Secretary commented that U.S. and Soviet representatives had been at work since 11:30 that morning to explore possibilities of developing acceptable joint language. It would be necessary to check with them before he and Shevardnadze could begin work. Gorbachev agreed. He proposed a break and quipped that the most important task facing the Foreign Ministers now was to find their subordinates.

Secretary Shultz confessed jocularly that he and Shevardnadze had agreed in a September dinner conversation that they should let their leaders carry as much of the burden in Geneva as possible. Until Gorbachev had given the Foreign Ministers their current assignment, they thought they had succeeded. Gorbachev suggested that the Secretary was simply trying to turn his joke about a walk around on him. The Secretary told him not to worry, that he (the Secretary) had a thick skin.

The President and Gorbachev agreed to adjourn the meeting and, after a ten minute conversation in the Mission reception room, retired to a separate area for an extended private conversation.

MEMORANDUM OF CONVERSATION

REGAN-GORBACHEV MEETINGS IN GENEVA
November, 1985

Mrs. Gorbacheva's Tea for Mrs. Reagan

DATE: November 20, 1985
TIME: 4:00 P.M. - 5:15 P.M.
PLACE: Soviet Mission,
Geneva, Switzerland

PARTICIPANTS:

United States

Mrs. Nancy Reagan
Mrs. Eugenia Arensbarger, Interpreter

Union of Soviet Socialist Republics

Mrs. Raisa Gorbacheva
Soviet Interpreter

* * * * *

Mrs. Gorbachev led Mrs. Reagan upstairs, where the walls of the first room were hung with children's posters. She explained that they were done by children of the Soviet Union for an exhibition entitled, "What the World Means to Me." She pointed out each poster in detail, noting the theme, as well as the name and age of the child. At the end of the tea, Mrs. Gorbachev presented Mrs. Reagan with the book of these posters.

A lavish Russian tea was served in the second room, with Mrs. Gorbachev explaining each dish and demonstrating the samovar.

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~
Declassify: OADR

DECLASSIFIED

NLS F96-087 #3

NARA DATE 5/15/07

CONFIDENTIAL

- 1 -

The ladies talked about their families, and the busy life each led as the wife of the head of the State/Party. Mrs. Gorbachev said that besides accompanying her husband on many trips, she continues to teach, keeps up correspondence with her former students, tries to keep up with the literature in her profession, and looks after the family. Her daughter, son-in-law and granddaughter live with the Gorbachevs.

Prepared by:
Eugenia Arensbürger

~~SECRET SENSITIVE~~

MEMORANDUM OF CONVERSATION

REAGAN-GORBACHEV MEETINGS IN GENEVA
November, 1985

Dinner Hosted by President and Mrs. Reagan

DATE: November 20, 1985
TIME: 8:00 P.M. - 10:30 P.M.
PLACE: Maison de Saussure,
Geneva, Switzerland

PARTICIPANTS:

United States

President Reagan
Mrs. Reagan
Secretary of State George Shultz
Chief of Staff Donald Reagan
Robert C. McFarlane, Assistant to the President for National
Security
Ambassador Arthur Hartzman
Mrs. E. Arensbarger, Interpreter
William Hopkins, Interpreter

Union of Soviet Socialist Republics

General Secretary Gorbachev
Mrs. Gorbacheva
Foreign Minister Eduard Shevardnadze
First Deputy Foreign Minister Georgy Korniyenko
Ambassador Anatoly Dobrynin
Ambassador Andrei M. Aleksandrov-Agentov
Mr. P. Palashchenko, Interpreter

* * * * *

The conversation began by continuing a topic touched upon at last night's dinner about the fact that people are marrying and having children younger now in the Soviet Union. Gorbachev said that, on the other hand, youth is becoming less responsible,

~~SECRET SENSITIVE~~
Declassify: OADR

DECLASSIFIED
NLS F96-087 #4
BY: dlb NARA, DATE 5/15/00

which is illustrated by a saying which the older generation now has; we must see our grandchildren through until they reach pension age.

Gorbachev again lovingly talked about his granddaughter. President Reagan told of a letter he received from a little girl who told him exactly what she wanted him to do and at the end said "Now go into the Oval Office and get to work."

Mrs. Gorbachev then told of a letter Gorbachev received which wished him success, expressed full agreement with his anti-alcohol campaign and said that the author kept Gorbachev's picture next to her icon. The author said she was 83 years old, prayed every day, and gave her telephone number. She then said to call only early in the morning; she was busy all other times. She lived in Kostroma. President Reagan asked whether Gorbachev called. The other replied that he would report as soon as he got back from Geneva.

Secretary Shultz asked about a revival of religion in the Soviet Union. Gorbachev replied that this question should be addressed to Mrs. Gorbachev, who taught a course on the topic; however, her course was on atheism rather than theology. Gorbachev said that many find the ritual, ceremonial part of religion attractive. However, true believers are dying out with the older generation. Still, one third of the population marry and baptize their children in the church. The Islamic religion, however, seems to have deeper roots. Shevardnadze confirmed that traditions survive in the Islamic religion. Gorbachev said that he was speaking of the Russian orthodox Church, which is preparing to celebrate the 1,000th anniversary of the Christianization of Russia. The church has even petitioned the government to return to a monastery for church use. Mrs. Gorbachev said there were also many sects in Russia, including the Baptists, Pentecostals and "Tresny."

Secretary Shultz asked whether Khomeini had had an influence on the Islamic population of the Soviet Union. Gorbachev answered, "No." He also said that right after the revolution there were many slogans for renouncing all of the past, as if doing away with everything which took place before the revolution. This was wrong, he said. But such were the times. He remembered that at that time even wearing a tie would brand one as a member of the bourgeoisie.

As for Khomeini, President Reagan said, he felt that both countries -- the U.S. and the USSR -- born of revolution, ought to keep an eye on another revolution: an attempt to bring about a fundamentalist Islamic revolution, where the revolution would become the government, and which teaches that the way to heaven is to kill a non-believer.

Gorbachev said that as we end this summit, he felt that he and President Reagan had truly made a start. It would have been unrealistic to expect great progress right away. But the whole world was very concerned, and it was a good thing that they had made this start. Donald Regan said that the President had said the same thing to him.

At this point President Reagan said that in one of the U.S.'s oldest towns, Philadelphia, a toast to the living is always given sitting down. Only a toast for the dead is given standing up. So he wanted to continue in this tradition because what the two sides were dealing with here definitely concerned the living. This is a beginning, he said. No matter what it was we failed to agree on, the important thing was that the two of them would continue to meet. Each of them had accepted an invitation to come to the other's country and continue these meetings. Even though the two of them had not agreed on many things, they had not closed the door. They would continue to meet.

One of the early leaders of the American Revolution, Thomas Payne, in those dark days when they did not know whether the revolution would succeed, said, "We have it in our power to start the world over again." Something of that is present in what we are doing today, because the problems we are trying to solve have plagued mankind for a long time.

We have started something, President Reagan said, and he felt that these meetings expressed the will and desire of both sides to find answers that would benefit not only all the people of the world now living, but also the yet unborn. His toast, therefore, and his devout prayer was that we could deliver something better than in the past. We will continue meeting, he said, and continue to work for those clauses which had brought the sides together here in Geneva.

Gorbachev answered, saying that he was confident tonight that the two of them had started something. After a very long interval between summit meetings, he shared the President's view that it would be wrong to give a false signal from Geneva. He said that Soviet side would very carefully assess the results of this meeting, fully cognizant of a mutual sense of responsibility. Every beginning is difficult. If now we have laid the first few bricks, he said, we have made a new start, a new phase has begun. This in itself is very important. The major differences are ahead, he said, but he wanted to invite the U.S. side to move ahead on the appointed road together with the Soviet side, with mutual understanding and a sense of responsibility. We will do our part on that road, he said. We will not change our positions, our values, or our thinking, but we expect that with patience and wisdom we will find ways toward solutions. We have had the opportunity to speak privately, he said, and he

SECRET/SENSITIVE

attributed great importance to those talks. Without them it would have been difficult to arrive at this result. Let us then move toward each other with an understanding of our responsibility before all the countries of the world. Gorbachev's toast was for better dialogue and cooperation, for which the Soviet Union was prepared and hoped for reciprocity from the United States.

* * * * *

AFTER-DINNER CONVERSATION

Having moved into the study after dinner, Secretary Shultz said he wanted to make a suggestion to both of the leaders about each of them making individual statements at the ceremony there would be tomorrow. He said in his personal opinion, he thought the people of the U.S. and USSR and the people of all the world really wanted to feel the presence of both of the world leaders at such a ceremony. If these leaders were simply present and went through the business of signing documents, it would not be the same thing as having them actually speak.

Gorbachev responded that in the first place he thought a joint statement or communique would represent the embodiment of the significance of such a document. Therefore, he said, he thought that a communique was of primary significance. Its presence would show that the current meetings had led to common judgments, common results and common motives in matters of principal importance. The Soviet side feels that such a document would demonstrate to the U.S. and Soviet peoples and to the world that the leaders of the two most powerful countries, despite their deep differences, are exercising their responsibility, and the document would show and convince the people of the world that the leaders were demonstrating their commitment to their principles. A joint document then would be a basis for further statements on the problems involved, both to each of the countries' allies and in the legislative bodies of both countries.

However, said Gorbachev, he thought if the leaders started to give commentaries, most especially short ones, on any document that they signed, it could very well detract from the significance of the document, because there might even be an unfortunate phrase which would detract from the weight and significance of the document. He said he hoped to save any possible document from that fate.

President Reagan responded that he begged to disagree with the General Secretary. He said that a full statement would be an honest, frank and open document about what had and had not

SECRET/SENSITIVE

- 3 -

been achieved, and about the fact that these meetings between them would be continuing. He suggested that what Secretary Shultz had been speaking about concerned the world press and the European press. He said that if he and General Secretary Gorbachev were there at a ceremony, they would not have to comment on the specifics of any document. However, hope in the world had grown as a result of this summit meeting, and people should not be disappointed in this respect.

General Secretary Gorbachev agreed to a statement of one to three minutes' duration by each of the leaders. President Reagan concurred and added that it had been his idea not to go into detail.

Gorbachev noted that one other thing bothered him, namely, that having produced a document, the sides do not believe in themselves; commenting on it, even briefly and generally, would only serve to strengthen and reaffirm the content of that document. The President responded that instead of being silent, it would be better for the people who have placed so much hope in the outcome of these meetings to hear that he and Gorbachev are going to continue to meet despite the fact that they have not solved all of the problems connected with the communique. He said that the tone and the need here were simply not to leave this meeting and have people disappointed that there had been no progress, and thus have the hopes of so many people dashed.

Gorbachev responded that both leaders' statements ought to be in support of the document, and the statement would not last longer than two to three minutes. Moreover, the statements should not concentrate on differences, but on areas where there was agreement. He said there was no need for rose-colored glasses. Both leaders could be frank about the result reflected in the document: meanwhile, the process of their meeting would be continuing.

President Reagan said it would be necessary to decide when and where the leaders would make their statements.

When some of those present suggested it might be a good idea to have the leaders' statements at 10:30 or 11:00 AM, President Reagan explained that he preferred 10 AM, because precisely 17 hours later he would be appearing on U.S. television and giving his report about this meeting to the U.S. Congress and the American people, so the upcoming day would certainly be one of the longest working days.

Secretary Shultz said he wanted to add one thing. He had just received information about the joint understanding, and apparently the work on it was going backward. He noted that

~~SECRET~~

U.S. aides had been instructed to stay up all night and work to get a document out, and he expressed the hope that the Soviet leader would give his people similar instructions. Shultz said the statements would be made in the Geneva International Conference Center at 10 AM.

Korniyenko asked, "Is there anything to announce?" Shultz responded there could be -- agreement had been reached about certain things; however, the Soviets were now beginning to go backward on some of what had been agreed.

Shevardnadze interjected that he had a question of principle. He said that it should be agreed not to detail differences but just make the statements in a general form.

Gorbachev said that he thought that the people involved were clever enough not to have the tail wag the fox, however, there are two foxes and two tails involved here. He said the sides ought not to come out with an empty document. Indeed, it would be better to have no document than an anemic one.

Secretary Shultz pointed out that the Soviet side was now beginning to link civil aviation and the cultural agreement. Korniyenko responded that it was Shultz who had always wanted to make those two things a package.

Shultz said that if it came to that, everything could be linked -- bilateral issues and regional issues. But it would be a mistake to make everything into such a package and link everything. Korniyenko said that it would be possible to say that the sides have completed working out details on exchanges but this should not be linked to other documents.

Gorbachev said that in conclusion it can be said that the Soviet side will give its people instructions to wind up and the U.S. side can give its people instructions to wind up, and they will, even if they have to be there all night.

Shultz said yes, all night, even if they have to be there without food. He said the U.S. was glad to a civil aviation agreement with the USSR, but there had to be in it commercial terms to make the route financially attractive to PanAm, otherwise the company would simply not fly the route and there was no reason for Aeroflot to have a monopoly on that market.

Korniyenko said that yesterday the Soviet side had compromised on that issue and then the U.S. had advanced 30 points which had knocked everything out of kilter.

To Gorbachev's suggestion that everyone continue working, Shultz said that it was good and the U.S. side would work all

night and that would be great if agreement could be achieved and if that were not possible, then there just would not be agreement.

Gorbachev said he thought he did not completely understand all the differences with all of the documents, but in any event he spoke to his people to the effect that he wanted everyone to get his act together and somehow iron out these last minute difficulties in regard to these issues.

President Reagan said that he and Gorbachev were meeting for the first time at this level. They had little practice, since they had never done it before. Nevertheless, having read the history of previous summit meetings he had concluded that those earlier leaders had not done very much. Therefore, he suggested that he and Gorbachev say, "To hell with the past," we'll do it our way and get something done.

Gorbachev concurred. The conversation broke up at 10:30 P.M.

Prepared by:

William Hopkins and
Eugenia Arensbarger,
Department of State

Timberg

9443

NATIONAL SECURITY COUNCIL
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20506

UNCLASSIFIED W/
CONFIDENTIAL ATTACHMENT

November 30, 1985

MEMORANDUM FOR MR. NICHOLAS PLATT
Executive Secretary
Department of State

COLONEL DAVID R. BROWN
Executive Secretary
Department of Defense

SUBJECT: NATO Consultations: Memcon (U)

Attached is the Memorandum of Conversation from the President's meeting with NATO Allies in Brussels on November 21, 1985. (U)

William F. Martin
William F. Martin
Executive Secretary

Attachment
Tab A Memcon

UNCLASSIFIED W/
CONFIDENTIAL ATTACHMENT *m77*

THE WHITE HOUSE
WASHINGTON

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~

MEMORANDUM OF CONVERSATION

SUBJECT: Summary of President's NATO Consultations:
Special Session of the North Atlantic Council

PARTICIPANTS: U.S.
The President
Secretary Shultz
Donald T. Regan
Robert C. McFarlane
Ambassador Abshire
Assistant Secretary Ridgway
Peter R. Sommer, NSC

Belgium
Prime Minister Martens
Foreign Minister Tindemans

Canada
Prime Minister Mulroney
Foreign Minister Clark

Denmark
Prime Minister Schluter
Foreign Minister Ellemann-Jensen

France
Foreign Minister Dumas
Ambassador Arnaud

FRG
Chancellor Kohl
Foreign Minister Genscher

Greece
Deputy Prime Minister Haralambopoulos
Ambassador Vassilicos

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~
Declassify on: OADR

DECLASSIFIED
NLS F96-087 #5
BY clb, NARA, DATE 5/15/00

Iceland

Prime Minister Hermannsson
Foreign Minister Hallgrimsson

Italy

Prime Minister Craxi
Foreign Minister Andreotti

Luxembourg

Prime Minister Santer
Foreign Minister Poos

Netherlands

Prime Minister Lubbers
Foreign Minister van den Broek

Norway

Prime Minister Willoch
Foreign Minister Stray

Portugal

Prime Minister Cavaco Silva
Foreign Minister Miranda

Spain

Foreign Minister Fernandez-Ordnonez
Ambassador Ojeda

Turkey

Prime Minister Ozal
Foreign Minister Halefoglu

United Kingdom

Prime Minister Thatcher
Foreign Minister Howe

DATE, TIME
AND PLACE:

November 21, 1985
4:15 - 5:45 p.m.
NATO Headquarters
Brussels, Belgium

In opening the meeting, Lord Carrington extended a personal welcome to the President and thanked him for attending the Special NAC. Carrington congratulated the President on his

accomplishments in Geneva and praised the very successful consultative process which took place prior to Geneva. He was confident that consultations would be a key feature of the future process. Carrington then noted that time is relatively short and he urged everyone to be brief in responding to the President.

(U)

The President said it was a special pleasure to be in Brussels to report on his two days of meetings with General Secretary Gorbachev. The President added he would also like to address the way ahead as the United States sees it for East-West relations. He praised NATO governments as having been instrumental in helping the United States and him personally to prepare for the Geneva meetings. NATO can rightfully claim part of the credit for the talks' success. The President emphasized that he did consider the talks successful -- an important step forward in our efforts to build a basis for more stable and constructive East-West relations. ~~(C)~~

The President expressed gratitude for the Allies' efforts to come to Geneva for today's meeting and thanked Lord Carrington in particular for making today's meeting a reality. The President opined that his discussions with Gorbachev confirmed that our approach to East-West relations is correct. We have based our policy on realism, strength and dialogue. He thought that common efforts to rebuild Western defenses, the equally important restoration of economic vitality and the reaffirmation of Alliance cohesion and solidarity had all helped convince the Soviet leaders that propaganda and intimidation will not serve their ends vis-a-vis the West. ~~(C)~~

The President noted that he had seen Gorbachev at the Geneva airport shortly before departing and the General Secretary -- who was on his way to Prague to brief the Warsaw Pact -- had asked the President to convey his best regards and greetings to the NATO members. The President jokingly added that he had told Gorbachev to do likewise in Prague. The President continued that he had had a considerable amount of private discussions with Gorbachev and believed that he had convinced the General Secretary that while arms reductions are exceedingly important, in a sense they tend to put the cart before the horse. Gorbachev seemed to accept and endorse the concept that we must first remove mutual suspicions and distrust. Nations do not distrust each other because they have large arsenals, rather they arm themselves because of distrust. The President added that he found the private discussions especially useful. In the plenary sessions, Gorbachev was clearly in charge; all others deferred to him. He acted with decisiveness and energy and frequently without a script. ~~(C)~~

Continuing, The President said Gorbachev had alleged that U.S.-Soviet relations were at their lowest level ever. He also said there was no opposition among the Soviet leadership towards immediate improvements and that it should be done without prior

conditions. It is also evident, said the President, that Gorbachev believes deeply in the Soviet system. He also labors under several misunderstandings about Western societies, particularly the United States. For example, he believes that the U.S.'s economic well being is dependent on military spending. The President said he explained that the Defense budget was a small part of our GNP. Gorbachev also noted that the U.S. and the Soviet Union were once Allies and that we have never been at war with each other. Interestingly, on several occasions Gorbachev said he prayed to God that this would never happen. On other occasions he also referred to the Deity. (C)

The President observed that he and Gorbachev had had rather extensive discussions of nuclear arms control questions both in the private and larger meetings. Gorbachev said he wanted to reduce the level of resources allocated to the defense sector. Gorbachev strongly opposed SDI. He made one point that the President said he had not heard before: that our defensive research could lead to heretofore, unknown offensive systems. The President said he had assured the General Secretary that SDI was a research program; that we would not deploy it without sitting down and discussing it with the Soviets. He had also expressed his personal hope that SDI could bring an end to nuclear war. He had also reaffirmed his readiness to explore with the Soviets ways of sharing any strategic defensive capabilities that emerge from the U.S. research program. Gorbachev asked why SDI would be needed if offensive weapons were reduced. The President said it would be insurance -- like gas masks which people kept even after the 1925 convention outlawing gas warfare. (C)

It was clear, observed the President, that we could not reconcile our differences over SDI. The President said he had made it plain that the U.S. will not give up research which is clearly permitted by the ABM Treaty and which we know the Soviets are also conducting. Calling SDI potentially one of the most important developments of this century, the President emphasized that he is convinced SDI holds out a real hope for a more secure world. Gorbachev was not pleased with my message, said the President, but we both agreed that our discussions had helped clear the air and that we should continue our work at the Geneva NST talks. (C)

The President continued that they had discussed other arms control issues. He had reviewed for Mr. Gorbachev the essential elements of the United States' most recent start proposal, emphasizing our agreement to seek reductions of 50 percent in strategic nuclear weapons. The President underscored that he had also made clear that these reductions had to be taken in appropriate and comparable categories of strategic weapons. On INF, the President said he offered an interim agreement that would cap NATO missiles at the level deployed at the end of this year. The Soviets, of course, would have to reduce their systems

within range of NATO Europe to the same levels, as well as making proportionate reductions in such systems located in Asia. In short, we called for global parity and we were able to agree to joint language envisioning the idea of an interim INF agreement. The President added that it had also been agreed that INF talks would not be held hostage to progress in space talks. They could go forward on their own. (e)

The President noted they had also reviewed other arms control issues. The joint statement that resulted from the Geneva meetings contained specific language on a number of areas. We expressed our mutual support for enhanced U.S.-Soviet cooperation in the field of nuclear non-proliferation. We agreed to study the feasibility of joint risk reduction centers. We endorsed the concept of a chemical weapons ban. We also emphasized the importance of achieving progress in the MBFR talks and we confirmed the need for concrete confidence-building measures as well as a reaffirmation of the non-use of force in the CDE negotiations. In this regard, the President noted that the General Secretary had said with the utmost intensity that the Soviet Union would never be the first to strike a blow or create a war. (e)

Turning to human rights, the President said he found it much more useful to discuss this privately and he had done so during their tete-a-tete sessions. The President said he had made it clear that progress on human rights could have a beneficial impact on the overall U.S.-Soviet relationship. He had also made it clear that should there be progress, he would refrain from taking credit or boasting about it. The President said he had raised several well known individual cases as well as the problem of Jewish emigration. He had also noted that there had been some recent progress on reuniting divided families. Looking at Chancellor Kohl, the President said he had also mentioned a human rights case of special interest to the Germans. He had tried to make clear to Gorbachev that even if the Soviets said human rights were an internal matter that they do have a direct effect on U.S. Congressional and public attitudes towards the Soviet Union. Gorbachev had asserted that all those who had asked to depart had been allowed to leave the Soviet Union. The President noted he had simply said we had a longer list and promised to pass it to Gorbachev. Only time will tell whether we will make real progress on human rights. (e)

The President noted that regional problems had also been discussed. He had pointed out how unacceptable Soviet activities in various Third World regions had created suspicion and distrust about Soviet motives. Gorbachev showed some sensitivity on this point and was quick to assert that the Soviet Union had no ambitions within the Third World. The President said in reply he had cited chapter and verse on Soviet military intervention in Afghanistan and the destabilizing activities of Cuban and Vietnamese proxies in Central America, Africa, and Indochina. The President said he had emphasized that the U.S. is not seeking

superiority or advantage through regional tensions or conflicts but that the U.S. is prepared to do whatever is necessary to maintain our security and that of our friends and Allies. We want to see regional conflicts resolved peacefully. He had repeated his U.N. regional initiative proposal. We disagreed on the causes of regional conflicts, but did agree to regularize periodic discussions between U.S. and Soviet experts. We also agreed that regional issues would continue to be discussed in depth by our Foreign Ministers. (C)

Saying he was afraid he had run on too long, the President commented that he wished to sum up briefly. He had always seen this first meeting not as a watershed event in and of itself, but rather an important part of a vital long-term process. As a demonstration of that fact, he was pleased to confirm that Gorbachev would come to Washington in 1986 and that he would visit Moscow in 1987. The President jokingly noted that this had been arranged while standing in the parking lot at the conclusion of the first day's session. The President thanked everyone for coming to Brussels and said he believed that we are headed in the right direction. With the Allies help we will stay on course. All and all the Geneva talks had produced more results than many had anticipated. The atmosphere was cordial. The President said he believed that Mr. Gorbachev knows as I do that progress in U.S.-Soviet relations would be a benefit to all the world. In concluding, the President said he would now be happy to answer questions or to hear views on any of the issues he had discussed.

(C)

Belgian Prime Minister Martens welcomed the President and other heads of government and national representatives to Brussels. He said that NATO consultations, of which the President had just given an excellent example, were extremely important in the effort to achieve a constructive dialogue in East-West relations. Martens said he had listened with great interest to the President and had only one question on which he wanted to be briefed. Belgium's prime objective in the security field was to see the success of substantial arms reductions through negotiation. Since Belgium had been one of the countries accepting INF deployment, Martens said he particularly wanted to ask how the Soviets had explained their position in the INF negotiations. The President replied that the U.S. and Soviets had not discussed specific elements of an INF agreement. The Soviets knew that our prime goal in INF was zero-zero. The main achievement was to separate INF from being held hostage to talks on SDI. (C)

FRG Chancellor Kohl thanked the President for his remarks and also for the intensive consultations which had occurred prior to the Geneva meeting. The Chancellor noted that it was this week, two years ago, that the FRG Bundestag was making its decision on INF deployment. There had been demonstrations of hundreds of

thousands in the streets and predictions of an ice age in East-West relations. The Chancellor said one could imagine how good he felt today because of the positive results which President Reagan had brought back from Geneva. No one could have expected that all of the problems which existed could be solved in one meeting, but progress had been made. A broad dialogue had been started which was important for everyone. Germany especially welcomed the concrete statements on MBFR and CW and added he would be interested in knowing if specific timetables had been set for progress on arms control, but in the interest of saving time, this could perhaps be answered during coming Ministerial meetings at NATO. He stressed that the West must not leave the initiative in East-West relations to the Soviets and that he was glad the President had raised human rights issues, which were very important. The hopes of millions of Germans, including those in East Germany, had been with the President. Kohl said that he was confident the climate in Geneva had not been like the weather outside and that even more progress would be made in the future. Kohl concluded by asking the President to convey his warm regards to Nancy who had played a wonderful role during the meeting. (C)

The President thanked the Chancellor for his kind words and said that the previous night Gorbachev had told him that he (Gorbachev) was an optimist. The President said he responded that he was known as an inveterate optimist. Meetings between leaders could produce results but had to be approached correctly. On human rights, for example, the President said that the United States had taken just the wrong approach some years ago. It had stated publicly what would happen if the Soviets did not improve their human rights performance. This, of course, made it impossible for the other side to comply and he would not take the same approach. Looking at the other leaders, the President emphasized that we all as politicians understood that progress becomes very difficult if we push the other person into a corner. (C)

The President went on to describe how he discussed arms control questions with Gorbachev. He went down a list of 12 dates, beginning in 1946, when the United States had made nuclear arms control proposals to the Soviets. On some of those occasions we were the only ones who possessed nuclear weapons or we had a clear superiority in them. Since the signing of the SALT I Agreement in 1969, however, the Soviets had added 6,000 warheads to their arsenal; they have added 3,250 just since the signing of SALT II; and they now possess even greater numbers. The President said he had made clear to Gorbachev that we did not seek nuclear superiority but neither would we allow the Soviets to gain superiority. We could build great arsenals or come together in a common sense way. The choice was thus either to agree to reduce nuclear weapons or to continue the arms race. Gorbachev indicated that he understood this reasoning. (C)

Spanish Foreign Minister Fernandez-Ordonez also thanked and congratulated the President and said the Geneva meeting had been an important step in East-West relations. He said he had only one question for the President. It was on the relationship of SDI to reductions in nuclear weapons. Did the President think some trade-off would be possible to promote such reductions? The President responded that he feels very strongly that we could not bargain away our right to do research in defensive systems. History showed that every offensive weapon had given rise to a defense. Since we are abiding by the terms of the ABM Treaty and would not automatically deploy any defense system, we cannot give away what might be the development of the century. Particularly with the U.S. open laboratories proposal, the Soviets should not fear our research. They have worked on defensive systems for years and we do not know how far they have gotten. The President said he told Gorbachev that, if reincarnation existed, he had perhaps been the man who invented the shield. (C)

Norwegian Prime Minister Willoch congratulated the President and expressed gratitude for what had been achieved in Geneva. Arms control was important, but it had also been correct for the President to raise regional issues and deal with human rights in a quiet manner. Willoch said it was important gradually to try to integrate the Soviet Union back into the mainstream of European civilization through promoting East-West contacts. Norway wished to avoid an arms race in space and favored maximum flexibility on SDI in order to get maximum reduction of offensive weapons. He noted that the excellent Alliance consultations, which had taken place on the NST talks had prevented Soviet wedge-driving tactics. He concluded with three short questions: Had there been discussion of continuing observation of the SALT II Treaty? Had the future of the ABM Treaty been discussed? And did it appear that the Soviets had given up their resistance to SDI research? (C)

The President said that the answer to the last question was unclear and remained to be seen. On the ABM Treaty, we were observing it whereas the Soviets were guilty of significant violations, such as the Krasnoyarsk radar. The question of SALT II observance had not come up for discussion. However, the President said that before his departure for Geneva, he had received a report with 23 documented Soviet violations of the SALT II Agreement. The President said, when he returned to Washington, he would have to face the decision of whether to give up on the SALT II Treaty or continue restraints, but only to the extent done by the Soviets. The point is that we are observing the Treaty and the Soviets are not. We will have to see whether we could afford to continue abiding by SALT II. (C)

British Prime Minister Thatcher warmly congratulated the President and said the joint statement indicated success in the meeting on far more things than had been generally expected. The West should, nonetheless, follow President Reagan's public lead in describing the meeting positively, but not being euphoric

about it. We should not build exaggerated public expectations which prove difficult to fulfill when the real nitty-gritty of agreements is being worked out. Thatcher continued that the presentation and style of the Soviet leadership have changed but the substance appears the same. Based on Gorbachev's comments about SDI, she predicted that the Soviets would continue a major propaganda effort against SDI in the coming year by promising radical weapons reductions in return for giving up SDI. She said the West must resist such a campaign, counter Soviet propaganda, and support the President in his efforts. As a final point, Thatcher said that she was very pleased to hear that the United States would continue to abide by the ABM Treaty and planned to respect the SALT II Agreement. In an uncertain world, it was vital that the two great powers observed existing arms control treaties. She concluded by again thanking the President and saying all members of the Alliance were grateful to him, and he had their full support. (C)

The President thanked the Prime Minister for her words and said the United States needed all the help and support possible from our Allies. He agreed that Gorbachev appeared to want to play a more active role in European affairs and that the Soviets saw the benefits that can come from different public presentation of their positions. (C)

Canadian Prime Minister Mulroney said the President had reestablished many simple, but powerful truths. The Geneva meeting had been a success because it was predicated on the strength of the United States and the entire Western Alliance joined in unity. The Soviet Union understood and respected these realities. Mulroney said he was glad that Geneva had set in motion a constructive dialogue and established a personal relationship between the President and Gorbachev. It was clear that the President had been well prepared and that the Alliance had been deeply involved in these preparations. The President could return to the United States -- to Congress and to Tip O'Neill -- with the respect and admiration of the Alliance, to which he had given true leadership. The President thanked Mulroney for considering Geneva such a success and said that Gorbachev has been successful in some things also. The President jokingly observed that at one dinner he sat next to Shevardnadze who had told him that the Soviets must now come to Geneva to get vodka. Thus it seemed Gorbachev was successful in shutting down alcohol sales. (C)

French Foreign Minister Dumas congratulated the President on what he called a remarkable performance. Thanking the President for taking the time to come to Brussels, he said that contacts, such as the Geneva meeting, were essential to East-West relations. For the foreseeable future, Western security will rest on the principle of deterrence, and he was thus glad to see that the joint statement had not made reference to the elimination of nuclear weapons as a desirable goal. Dumas continued that it was also necessary to avoid concepts of security zones based on an illusory Euro-strategic balance. He said he was confident

that the President in his negotiations would keep in mind the security interests of Allies. An eventual agreement on nuclear weapons should be based on the lowest possible balance between U.S. and Soviet forces, and not between Soviet forces and those of all other nuclear powers combined as the Soviets would want. Dumas concluded with two questions: Had there been progress in Geneva on definition of strategic weapons which would be cut by 50 percent? And, what were the elements of an interim INF agreement which would give reason to believe that such an agreement was possible? (C)

The President said that both sides accepted the principle of a 50 percent reduction, but there had been no effort in Geneva to negotiate the specifics of such an agreement. Our counter-counter proposal and the Soviet proposal were clearly structured differently. He and Gorbachev had focused on the possibility of setting down guidelines for the arms control negotiators to pursue. The President noted that Secretary Shultz had been awake most of the night working on the joint statement and could perhaps comment more. The Secretary said that it had been considered desirable to reaffirm a 50 percent reduction goal, but considerable differences remained on what the 50 percent would apply to. There had also been no progress on specific elements of an INF agreement, except for an understanding that INF negotiations could proceed separately and not be held hostage to other ongoing arms control talks. (C)

Italian Prime Minister Craxi expressed satisfaction that the meeting had been successful and brought an opening of dialogue. He had no new questions, but wanted to voice a feeling of satisfaction. This new dialogue should lead to greater understanding and trust between East and West. Craxi said it was apparent that the President had shown flexibility during the meeting and the objective of peace deserved such an approach. Gorbachev was a new leader and might in time bring changes. He had to be tested, of course, and there would no doubt be disappointments along the way. Craxi concluded by again congratulating the President and citing an Italian proverb: He who starts well is half the way to his goal. (C)

Turkish Prime Minister Ozal warmly congratulated the President on his successful meeting. He was very pleased to see progress made in Geneva, though he shared the view of Mrs. Thatcher on a likely Soviet campaign against SDI. He asked if the Middle East and the Iran-Iraq war had been raised in Geneva? The Secretary replied jokingly that while the President was doing something or another by the fireplace, the workers of the world did discuss these matters. The Middle East did not come up in the plenary. He had, however, discussed the Middle East in his general regional review with Shevardnadze, but there was nothing of significance to report from the conversation. The President added in jest that while the Secretary was having these talks, he (the President) was with a friend named Gorbachev. (C)

Danish Prime Minister Schluter said that everyone shared the hope that this was the beginning of a new start in East-West relations. What happened between the two major powers could influence developments everywhere, even in Eastern Europe. He thanked the President for this meeting and also for prior consultations in which the U.S. shared its thinking on preparations for the Summit. Now that the East-West dialogue would continue, he expressed the hope that such close and intensive consultations would also continue. Schluter remarked that one of the main East-West issues was the need to establish a stable offense/defense relationship. He asked the President if it was still an open question whether the Soviets would ever accept even limited numbers of defensive weapons? The President responded that yes, it remained an open question, although the Soviets knew how strongly we feel about continuing research. (C)

Portuguese Prime Minister Cavaco Silva said he followed the President's remarks with great interest and appreciated all of the consultations which had taken place. He was particularly grateful for the President's presence today. Portugal supported the American position on radical reductions in nuclear arsenals, but recognized that arms control was not the only element in East-West relations. Regional issues were also important, particularly since solution of regional problems depended on the relationship between the two super powers. He asked in this context whether the situation in Southern Africa had been discussed in Geneva? (C)

The President replied he had not discussed Southern Africa, and asked Secretary Shultz if it had been raised at the Foreign Minister level. The Secretary said it had been raised briefly, though there was nothing special to report. The Secretary added, however, that the overall Soviet approach to regional issues was significant. Discussion showed that the Soviets considered regional issues important and were prepared to have regular meetings on them. The Soviets did not accept the President's UN initiative on regional problems, but seemed to recognize that there must be some way of talking about the subject. This was especially apparent on Afghanistan which the two sides discussed more deeply. (C)

Greek Deputy Prime Minister Haralambopoulos extended warm thanks to the President for his remarks and expressed deep appreciation for the consultations, which showed the legitimate interest of the Alliance partners in these issues. He said that Greece has repeatedly stated its wish to see nuclear arsenals reduced to the lowest possible levels and was one of the participants in a five continent appeal to nuclear powers to undertake such reductions. Greece was very pleased that the President and Gorbachev had established a working relationship, which opened the path to more constructive relations in the future. Every effort should be made that future meetings are held in the same constructive spirit. Haralambopoulos said he wanted to conclude by quoting one of President Reagan's statements: A nuclear war cannot be won and must never be fought. (C)

Icelandic Prime Minister Hermannsson, after thanking the President for coming to Brussels, said that the Icelandic Government and people were fully behind the President's efforts to increase confidence in East-West relations and to end the arms race. He hoped that the President saw the Geneva meeting as an important step, since in the past the President had commented on the futility of dealing with the Soviets. He asked if there was any possibility that a nuclear test ban treaty might come in the future? The President responded that a test ban could be possible. Our resistance to recent proposals has come from the fact that the United States is playing catch up and a test ban would freeze the present imbalance. The United States has fewer nuclear weapons now than in 1969. The President remarked that Gorbachev appeared shocked to hear this. A test ban might be possible after parity has been achieved. The President added that when President Kennedy met with Khrushchev, there had been agreement on a three-year test ban. When it ended, the Soviets suddenly embarked on tests which suggested that they had been doing research all along in preparation for the end of the test ban. The United States could not have conducted such tests because it had not been doing research. The President said Kennedy quickly realized that the Soviets had taken advantage of the test ban. (C)

Dutch Prime Minister Lubbers thanked the President for what had been accomplished in Geneva and said he was impressed with how enthusiastically the President spoke of the meeting. He jokingly said the President appeared to be in the third youth of his life. His enthusiasm clearly gave the impression that a new relationship was starting. The Netherlands realized and accepted that such a dialogue must combine realism and strength and hoped that Europe could contribute toward promoting the dialogue. It was essential to avoid a situation in which suspicion and mistrust could again arise. For that reason continued adherence to the ABM and SALT II Treaties was particularly important. Lubbers noted that in the joint statement at Geneva the two leaders called for acceleration of the NST talks. He asked the President what this word meant and whether specific timetables had been agreed upon. Lord Carrington noted that time is running short and asked the President to hold his answer until after Luxembourg's Prime Minister spoke. (C)

Luxembourg Prime Minister Santer thanked the President for his mission, calling it a difficult and complex one. He said East-West relations could now be viewed with greater optimism. Luxembourg hoped that the meeting, which had already brought a new climate, would also bring positive results on disarmament questions. (C)

The President thanked Santer for his kind words. Responding to the Dutch Prime Minister's question, the President said that no timetable had been set in Geneva, but the two leaders had agreed to tell their NST negotiators to go after it. The President

said jokingly that even if they didn't, he and Gorbachev could do so themselves because they had agreed to communicate directly. Noting that he had to fly off to Washington to address Congress -- which may wait, but television will not -- the President thanked the leaders for coming to Brussels and for their questions. He said before leaving he wanted to give one short example of how he had tried to test Gorbachev's sense of humor. He told Gorbachev the story of an American and a Soviet citizen who were debating freedom in their respective countries. The American said that he could walk into the Oval Office, pound his fist on the table, and say that he didn't like how President Reagan ran the United States. The Soviet citizen responded that he could do the same. He could walk into the Kremlin, pound his fist on the table, and say that he didn't like how President Reagan ran the United States. (C)

In closing, SYG Carrington thanked the President for coming to Brussels and said that Gorbachev would be very lucky if he had the same support at his meeting in Prague as had been shown to the President here in Brussels. He wished the President a good flight home and a successful meeting with Congress.

The meeting concluded at 5:45 p.m. (U)