

# Ronald Reagan Presidential Library

## Digital Library Collections

---

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

---

**Collection:** Press Secretary, White House Office  
of: Press Releases and Press Briefings  
**Folder Title:** Press Releases: 9353-9353  
**Box:** 118

---

To see more digitized collections visit:

<https://reaganlibrary.gov/archives/digital-library>

To see all Ronald Reagan Presidential Library inventories visit:

<https://reaganlibrary.gov/document-collection>

Contact a reference archivist at: [reagan.library@nara.gov](mailto:reagan.library@nara.gov)

Citation Guidelines: <https://reaganlibrary.gov/citing>

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

## THE WHITE HOUSE

Office of the Press Secretary  
(Geneva, Switzerland)

FOR IMMEDIATE RELEASE

NOVEMBER 18, 1985

PRESS BRIEFING  
BY NATIONAL SECURITY ADVISOR  
ROBERT C. MCFARLANE

November 18, 1985

Centre International de Conferences de Geneve

6:10 P.M. (L)

MR. MCFARLANE: Thanks very much. Today on the eve of his meetings with the General Secretary of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, President Reagan feels a very deep sense of responsibility, challenge, of opportunity. He looks forward with great determination to making of this meeting everything that is possible in the way of reducing tensions and establishing a framework for solving problems in the coming years. As he said in leaving the United States, he has come on a mission of peace, he intends to present his own views very clearly on the need to strengthen and stabilize the nuclear balance, to restrain the use of force and subversion, to expand influence beyond Soviet borders, to increase and expand respect for human rights, and to improve communications between both the peoples and the governments of both countries.

The President's goals in each of these four areas of regional, bilateral, security, and human rights areas are well-known publicly. However, he will treat each of them in great detail, present his ideas on how to make progress. He approaches this meeting with a very strong sense of realism -- realism in the sense of understanding a point which is often ignored and that has been, at least in past meetings, and that is that peace -- enduring peace -- isn't based upon meetings; it depends upon having policies that work; it depends upon policies that make clear America's determination to defend her interests, to solve problems where we can, but to fulfill our responsibilities where we must.

In this fashion, in presenting a proposal based upon realism, the President believes that we can better avoid swings between complacency and confrontation. Neither of these extremes historically in our country have served our policy interest very well. And I think the historical record makes clear that the one can all too often encourage the other.

In the late 1950's, for example, the spirit of Geneva gave way to years of crisis centered around Berlin. In the late 1960's, the so-called Spirit of Glassboro was dispelled by the invasion of Czechoslovakia. In short, the spirit did not express fundamental change in the policies of the Soviet Union or of a greater willingness to reduce tensions and solve problems. And in early 1970's, the confidence that was born in so many of us that the arms control process would, by itself, bring an improvement in U.S.-Soviet relations was followed very quickly by the invasion of and continued occupation to this day, of Afghanistan.

President Reagan believes that we have to do better than that. Doing better has been the goal of all of his policies since 1981. He believes that all of us can learn and profit from the experience of past meetings like this. Having profited,

MORE

Q The administration has taken the position in the past that Moscow funds certain terrorist groups -- their activities globally. Yet, over the past few days, we've heard from you yesterday and various other administration officials that the U.S. and the Soviets are in concert on the problem of terrorism in the world. Is this a change in administration policy, and to what extent will the two sides be discussing the problem of terrorism and possible solutions? And specifically, do you still look to Moscow as this centerboard for terrorist activities?

MR. MCFARLANE: The United States, I think all countries, are concerned about the threat of terrorism to all of our citizens in every country. I'm not sure I am familiar with the references you make to our possible cooperation with the Soviet Union. Needless to say, we would hope for a cooperative attitude by the Soviet Union toward terrorism.

Historically, the Soviet Union's association with a number of states who are known to be centers of terrorism is -- gives one no great cause for optimism. That said, to answer your question, yes, it will be on the agenda, and our purpose will be to try to engender a change in Soviet attitudes toward this problem and that curtailment of their support for countries that do engage in it.

Q Mr. McFarlane, you said in your press conference just now that the President is prepared to discuss the Middle East and the Gulf War in his discussions with the Soviets. This was not the attitude of President Reagan when he made his speech in the United Nations, and he mentioned only 5 points of regional problems -- not included the Middle East. Is there any reason for this change?

MR. MCFARLANE: The President is prepared to discuss regional issues in a very global sense. His proposal at the United Nations was oriented toward existing conflicts where people are dying today and which -- in which the conflict is being sustained in whole or in part by Soviet support to one side or another, and where the prospect for self-determination is foreclosed, really, by that outside support. That said, focusing on them was because they are more urgent, because there are existing wars that hold the promise of expanding. It is not to say that we aren't prepared to talk about other regional issues, too, which we are. And I would expect in that sense that we are ready to talk about the Middle East, the Persian Gulf -- every global or regional issue we are ready to discuss. It was in that sense that I commented.

Q Mr. McFarlane, you've just said that it would be useful to have cooperation in the fight against terrorism. The President of the United States said correct words that terrorists are guilty for hijacking airplanes should be handed over to the state which has jurisdiction so that they may be punished.

This was said after the United States had forced an Egyptian aircraft to land. From the beginning of the '70's, the United States have harbored two criminals -- a father and a son -- Brazinkas, who had hijacked a Soviet aircraft and murdered a 19 year-old stewardess -- N. Kurchinka her name was. Perhaps the United States might follow their own appeal and also the advice of the President of the United States and could hand those criminals back to the Soviet Union. Thank you, sir.

MR. MCFARLANE: I think that the United States abhorrence for hijacking, for any other form of terrorism, is surely as emphatic as in any country. That's been a matter of consistent U.S. policy throughout our history. The instance that you mention is one in which people who are charged with violations of law in other countries and who are in the United States availing themselves of our judicial process have, because they can, exercise the free access to judicial remedies, taken time, and that delay is normal associated with our court system and with that of many countries, I would say, who insist upon great care in providing full due process before people are convicted and imprisoned. It doesn't reflect a judgment by the United States one way or the other on the guilt or innocence of those people. It is the nature of our judicial process and that it isn't a position in which our government intervenes or takes a position.

Q To follow up -- but they hijacked Soviet plane and they killed Soviet hostess.

MR. MCFARLANE: The determination of their guilt or innocence is a matter that we leave to our courts and, ultimately, to other courts where they may be charged. So, I can't comment on whether they are guilty or innocent. We do avail anybody in our country of due process.

Q Mr. McFarlane, going back to the incident with that young lady which arose out of the fact that this morning at the airport she asked -- during the speech of Gorbachev, she asked him whether he would release Sakharov. Do you think that this sort of thing -- her asking that question -- and she carried the credential of, I understand, a respected Dutch newspaper -- can do the slightest harm or damage to the summit?

MR. MCFARLANE: Well, I think that the exercise of basic freedoms can never be truly harmful. I think people who live in free countries are used to the expression of the individual views and, as long as they're expressed in ways that don't detract from those of others, that's life.

Q This is a side issue of terrorism -- it's the mission of Mr. Waite. There are reports that he is going back to Beirut and prepared to conduct some sort of shuttle. One, do you know that this is the case, and two, are we -- are you doing anything that might be construed by the kidnappers to be negotiating?

MR. MCFARLANE: We were to have been in touch today with Mr. Waite in London and I have to say I haven't gotten a report upon those exchanges and so I couldn't really confirm or deny it, because I don't know whether Mr. Waite has headed back or not. We have supported his efforts. Through him we have made clear, as we've said publicly, that we've always been willing to communicate with the captors of our hostages to exchange views, to hear their complaints, and to reaffirm, personally, our own policies. Now, that is different from changing our policy and we don't intend to do that, nor to make concessions to terrorists, but we will communicate, yes.

Q During the summit, will Mr. Reagan take and table the oppressions against the Turks in Bulgaria?

MR. MCFARLANE: The President will deal with as many

issues as it possible. I couldn't promise that that will be treated, but he's conscious of the situation and he wants to get as much done as he can here.

Q Mr. McFarlane -- I would like to ask you one question. How would you view such a situation that if a Soviet Union will support a person who will break your press conferences here or will break the President Reagan's speech at the airport. I think that lady who's right for freedom you defended here has the support from the United States because you support such so-called freedom fighters.

MR. MCFARLANE: I don't mean to be contentious in saying this, but I think people in free countries espouse and support and acknowledge that people have an inherent right to express their point of view and this person is not someone who is doing something put up or inspired by the United States. Our government has nothing to do with this person. She is a free human being.

Q Could you give us some information about the meeting between President Reagan and Swiss President Furgler?

MR. MCFARLANE: The meeting was a very cordial one in which President Reagan had the opportunity to express his deep gratitude and respect with the Swiss Confederation and for its hosting of this meeting with the General Secretary. He has well expressed his great respect for Switzerland's historic role over time in being seen as and being, in fact, a country devoted to the resolution of problems, to being a country quite capable, not only at peacekeeping, peacemaking, but at humanitarian undertakings and he mentioned, in particular, the founding of the Red Cross.

The meeting also encompassed the bilateral relationship between the United States and Switzerland which is quite good. A few issues were

treated in particular to include the civil air service and a pending negotiation for expanding air service between Switzerland and the United States; also, matters on technology transfer, and of information access, and so forth. Each of these proceeding amicably toward resolution. And both Presidents expressed pleasure at that.

The Swiss President provided his very strong encouragement to the talks to be held in the coming days and his wish that they can produce an outcome that includes a reduction of tensions and over time the settlement of disagreements. It was a very harmonious meeting, pleasant. The President parted, again expressing his deep thanks for President Furgler, his colleagues, and of his country as hosts.

Q To change the subject, may I have your comment on the letter of Mr. Weinberger which was printed in the American press before reaching the President?

MR. MCFARLANE: The Secretary's letter was in response to a request from the President this past June that he evaluate Soviet compliance and make recommendations as to whether their violations had created additional threats or an expanded threat to the United States and our allies, and if that were the case, what should be done about it. The first part of the report, which is attached to the letter you mentioned, has been received. A second part, which will be the recommendations based upon these findings, will be received after the President's return.

When he made this request in June, the President said, please look at the compliance record, take into account the Soviet good faith in the Geneva arms talks. In addition, take into account Soviet building programs and additional offensive systems and integrate all of that into recommendations on what to do. That material will be staffed, and the views of all appropriate Cabinet officers heard. And I expect the President would make decisions within a month or so.

Q Is the issue of the Soviet -- of the Jewish emigration from the Soviet Union a cornerstone in opening the Middle East file here for you? Is it a precondition? And, secondly, on Afghanistan, there has been talk of guarantees, as you know, in the UN plan for Soviet-Afghanistan problem by the Security Council members. And I don't know what your position towards guarantees of the status of Afghanistan, once the UN plan is implemented.

SENIOR ADMINISTRATION OFFICIAL: On the first question, the United States' position toward Soviet participation and the resolution of Middle East problems doesn't have any preconditions on it per se, related to Jewish emigration, nor to restoration of relations, nor to any other precondition.

That said, we believe that it's reasonable to expect that any country -- the Soviet Union or anyone else -- who wishes to participate in a peace process not be supportive of those who are most opposed to it. Consequently, the current Soviet position, supporting as it does the extremist elements who are devoted to resisting that process, seems to disqualify them from a constructive role.

Concerning Afghanistan, the United States reference to guarantees has been in the context of possible guarantees we might make with the Soviet Union if they are interested. After the internal parties to the struggle -- the Afghan freedom fighters and the client government there engage together and talk to each other and come to terms, it's possible that we might be helpful in providing some kind of guarantees there. We do indeed support the United Nations efforts -- the Cordobas mission -- and don't wish to interfere with that in any way. If we can be helpful afterward or in a separate context, we'd be glad to.

Q I would like to ask, do you think during this meeting the United States is going to have some answer to stop the Nicaraguan problem, to stop the Nicaraguan invasion to Central America and expansion of the socialist regime in Central America?

MR. MCFARLANE: Well put. I think surely the United States will take up that issue and express our views very clearly on our concern on the issue as you cast it, and that is, the expansion of subversion from Nicaragua as a base and with its support in neighboring countries. Yes, that will surely be on the agenda. We would hope for progress and it depends upon good faith interest on the part of the Soviet Union.

Q Will you reject beforehand any linkage on regional issues between Afghanistan and Nicaragua? There was talk of an idea for a deal saying that if the Soviets are willing to retrieve their troops from Afghanistan and advisors or Cuban advisors in Nicaragua you could decide to stop funding the Contras in Nicaragua. Is any kind of linkage like this completely out of the discussion at this point?

MR. MCFARLANE: I don't really think there is a correspondence there between the situation in Nicaragua and Afghanistan, and therefore I don't think that there is a basis for linkage as you put it. The United States has no combat forces in either country. The United States has taken a position that it supports those who ask nothing more than pluralism, self-determination, and we support those with that stance. The Soviet Union has over 100,000 troops in Afghanistan, over 1,000 Soviet advisors and so forth in Nicaragua, a total of 10,000 bloc Cuban Soviet personnel there. We call for their departure, for the reduction of the Nicaraguan military to a level that is no greater than that of its neighbors, of a severance of the military ties with the Soviet Union and Cuba, and of a commitment, hopefully, to stop exporting this subversion to neighboring states.

Q The American position seems to be that the Afghan people have the right to self-determination because they are under occupation according to the U.S. position. Doesn't that same principle apply to the Palestinian people who have been under occupation since 1967?

MR. MCFARLANE: The United States has always supported self-determination for all peoples. It has taken on a special connotation in the Palestinian context as you know, where it is explicitly linked to the formation of an independent Palestinian state. President Reagan doesn't believe that that is the most stable approach to the resolution of the Palestinian problem. He expressed his views in September of 1982, and they have not changed since.

However, it is less important what American views are and more important what is negotiated between the parties themselves -- in this case, Jordan. Palestinian participation is surely anticipated in direct talks with the government of Israel. That's what we're trying to achieve now.

Q Mr. McFarlane, could you tell us the criterias on which you personally would decide on Wednesday evening whether the summit was a success or a failure.

MR. MCFARLANE: Well, I don't mean to be frivolous, but I would decide on Wednesday evening that it had succeeded if a year from now there were peace, a more stable relationship, reduction of arms, expanded cooperation between the U.S. and the Soviet Union. And one simply won't know this Wednesday if any of those conditions we'll obtain. And so you can't pronounce the outcome as good or bad until you have seen whether the parties leave and are better able to solve problems than when they came.

Now, there may be a measure of agreement on certain issues and we welcome that -- we want to get as much agreement as we can, but let's not pretend that smiles and good faith commitments are as important as deeds and actions. And that's what we're looking for -- a commitment to a pattern of behavior that is consistent with fundamental international law and the principle of the peaceful resolution of disputes.

Q Can you tell us whether there are any peculiarities in the ground rules tomorrow for the meeting with the two leaders? Will both of them use simultaneous translation?

MR. MCFARLANE: The ground rules for the American-hosted session is that there will be simultaneous translation. I am told that that is also in agreement with the Soviet Union for when they host on Wednesday, so for all sessions, simultaneous.

Q Mr. McFarlane, recently in an interview with 4 Soviet journalists, President Reagan stated that the invasion of Grenada came about as a result of an invitation by the government. I think it's a view that you also repeated yesterday. I was in Grenada at the time of the invasion. Is it not true that the so-called invitation came from the Governor General of the country who was their representative of the Queen of England and not the head of the government of Grenada. And secondly, do you intend, or does the President intend to include the problems in South Africa in your discussions on regional issues?

MR. MCFARLANE: On the first question concerning Grenada, you're quite right. It was Governor General Scoon that made the request. He was reinforced by that by several state members of the East Caribbean community. But that is quite right, and I believe in the President's interview that



was editorially changed because that is what is -- in fact, is what he said in fact. But you're right. The issue of Southern Africa and events there will be on the agenda.

Q Mr. McFarlane, I would like to know the answer to two questions. In the first place, how can the United States talk about Soviet intervention in Nicaragua when the United States finances groups and establishes military bases against Nicaragua and Honduras that is against Nicaragua -- I mean against the government of Nicaragua and against the people who support that government? Why doesn't the United States begin by taking hands off Nicaragua -- that is a first question -- and respect democracy in that country?

The second question is don't you think that the uptake of confrontation East-West limits self determination of several countries in the Third World? That is you cannot -- from my point of view, you cannot always talk about confrontation East-West when government is not allowed to the United States?

MR. MCFARLANE: On the first point, concerning Nicaragua, let's recall that the Sandinista Revolution in 1979 came to power committed formally to the OAS to hold elections provide for pluralism, basic institutions of democracy and that soon thereafter the members of that revolution that held to the Marxist point of view captured the institutions of power and ruled out all of the promises that they had made regarding elections and the free exercise of basic civil liberties. That pattern of behavior has continued, most recently being reconfirmed on October 15th by the extension of the state of emergency which basically deprives the people of almost all civil liberties.

Against that kind of performance, where the Church is limited in what it can do, where labor unions are all but foreclosed, where the press is all but denied, it's not surprising that opposition develops among the Nicaraguan people. This isn't American-inspired. It's a home-grown criticism by Nicaraguans of the subversion of their own revolution.

Those people call for nothing more than a dialogue with the Sandinista government. They simply want to talk to their own people about having elections, and, in fact, what they promised in 1979. If they would do that, the United States would have no problem with it at all.

These people seem to express -- although it's not my judgment to make -- the will of Nicaraguan people to the extent that their ranks are swelling and growing every day. And it appears that the government -- the Sandinista government is having a more and more difficult time in attracting people into its own armed forces.

On the separate point that you make about whether it isn't wrong to cast local problems into an East-West context, I agree with you. We hope, as well, that the Soviet Union won't, by exporting its own ideology, by military power and subversion, do that itself.

The United States seeks the independent, sovereign development of every country. We are willing to be helpful in addition, beyond using weapons alone, which is Soviet policy, but by providing for free trade, economic assistance and the access to the American market of their products.

In the President's formula at the United Nations, our proposal for solving the several existing wars was not to cast them in an East-West area and to call first for the people in each place to talk to each other, without any Soviet or American involvement whatsoever. For I agree with you, these should not be East-West issues. And if the Soviet Union had not made them so by providing military power and physical intervention, they wouldn't be so.

Q Mr. McFarlane, do you think is it possible to reach and fulfill peace in Middle East without dealing with PLO and Mr. Arafat?

MR. MCFARLANE: The Palestinian cause and the resolution of that problem is an issue to which the United States is very strongly devoted.

The PLO approach has been, from the beginning, to rely upon armed struggle to establish that identity. And it hasn't worked. In three wars in the course of 15 years, the PLO has been either deserted or damaged badly by violence and still has not succeeded in establishing the identity that it seeks for Palestinians. So we don't think that's the right course. And for as long as the PLO is devoted to terrorism, refuses to recognize Israel or acknowledge the United Nations Resolutions which provide a framework for a solution, we don't see that they are taking a constructive position and we have nothing to say to them.

When the point comes where the PLO renounces violence, acknowledges Israel's right to exist and supports those U.N. Resolutions, 242 and 338, that provides a basis for dialogue.

THE PRESS: Thank you very much.

END

7:20 P.M. (L)

#9553

THE WHITE HOUSE

Office of the Press Secretary  
(Geneva, Switzerland)

FOR IMMEDIATE RELEASE

NOVEMBER 18, 1985

PRESS BRIEFING  
BY NATIONAL SECURITY ADVISOR  
ROBERT C. MCFARLANE

November 18, 1985

Centre International de Conferences de Geneve

6:10 P.M. (L)

MR. MCFARLANE: Thanks very much. Today on the eve of his meetings with the General Secretary of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, President Reagan feels a very deep sense of responsibility, challenge, of opportunity. He looks forward with great determination to making of this meeting everything that is possible in the way of reducing tensions and establishing a framework for solving problems in the coming years. As he said in leaving the United States, he has come on a mission of peace, he intends to present his own views very clearly on the need to strengthen and stabilize the nuclear balance, to restrain the use of force and subversion, to expand influence beyond Soviet borders, to increase and expand respect for human rights, and to improve communications between both the peoples and the governments of both countries.

The President's goals in each of these four areas of regional, bilateral, security, and human rights areas are well-known publicly. However, he will treat each of them in great detail, present his ideas on how to make progress. He approaches this meeting with a very strong sense of realism -- realism in the sense of understanding a point which is often ignored and that has been, at least in past meetings, and that is that peace -- enduring peace -- isn't based upon meetings; it depends upon having policies that work; it depends upon policies that make clear America's determination to defend her interests, to solve problems where we can, but to fulfill our responsibilities where we must.

In this fashion, in presenting a proposal based upon realism, the President believes that we can better avoid swings between complacency and confrontation. Neither of these extremes historically in our country have served our policy interest very well. And I think the historical record makes clear that the one can all too often encourage the other.

In the late 1950's, for example, the spirit of Geneva gave way to years of crisis centered around Berlin. In the late 1960's, the so-called Spirit of Glassboro was dispelled by the invasion of Czechoslovakia. In short, the spirit did not express fundamental change in the policies of the Soviet Union or of a greater willingness to reduce tensions and solve problems. And in early 1970's, the confidence that was born in so many of us that the arms control process would, by itself, bring an improvement in U.S.-Soviet relations was followed very quickly by the invasion of and continued occupation to this day, of Afghanistan.

President Reagan believes that we have to do better than that. Doing better has been the goal of all of his policies since 1981. He believes that all of us can learn and profit from the experience of past meetings like this. Having profited,

MORE

having absorbed those lessons, he's committed in the next two days to charter a course that can be sustained by the American people and by our allies. Its aim is very simple: to make restraint the most realistic Soviet option.

I suppose the most frequently asked questions by all of you and our colleagues is whether this meeting is going to be a success or a failure. Certainly, President Reagan hopes for progress. He's going to give all of his effort to achieving progress wherever possible. But the real answer to that question will not be immediately apparent. He hasn't come to Geneva to seek one or two days of atmospheric improvements, but instead to put down a strong foundation of understanding of our goals, purposes, interests, and resolve, in the hope that by that foundation we will engender a process through which progress can be made and results achieved.

I'd be glad to take your questions now.

Q Mr. McFarlane, why did you say earlier this afternoon that you found it interesting that in his remarks this morning about the danger of extending the arms race that Mr. Gorbachev used the word extending it into spheres and not into space? What's significance is there in that?

SENIOR ADMINISTRATION OFFICIAL: Well, I couldn't pretend that there is a significance, but it was striking to the extent that it was different. Past Soviet formulas have been very precise in foreclosing the conduct of any activity related to strategic defense. There wasn't a reference to strategic defense per se. So, I wouldn't put too fine a point on that, but it is different.

Q Before you came here this afternoon, Mr. McFarlane, a Soviet press conference was broken up by a young lady who claimed to be a Russian emigre. The Russian spokesman strongly intimated that the other side might have had something to do with this breakup. Are you engaging in a publicity competition with the Russians before the conference?

SENIOR ADMINISTRATION OFFICIAL: On your specific question, we had, at first, nothing at all to do with the incident as it was reported to me. On your second question, President Reagan hasn't come here to engage in a publicity competition. He's come to engage in a serious dialogue with the Soviet leadership. Whether as a collateral matter our case is well or badly presented, I think only you can judge.

Q Following up on that, do you think that the summit is in any way in danger of being disrupted by a human rights protest?

SENIOR ADMINISTRATION OFFICIAL: It's very clear that human rights is a terribly important issue on the agenda. The President hasn't put it there for reasons of causing embarrassment or of exploitation. It's because it is a very -- an issue of great conviction by the American people. I would expect those discussions to be private and to, I hope, remain private.

Q The administration has taken the position in the past that Moscow funds certain terrorist groups -- their activities globally. Yet, over the past few days, we've heard from you yesterday and various other administration officials that the U.S. and the Soviets are in concert on the problem of terrorism in the world. Is this a change in administration policy, and to what extent will the two sides be discussing the problem of terrorism and possible solutions? And specifically, do you still look to Moscow as this centerboard for terrorist activities?

MR. MCFARLANE: The United States, I think all countries, are concerned about the threat of terrorism to all of our citizens in every country. I'm not sure I am familiar with the references you make to our possible cooperation with the Soviet Union. Needless to say, we would hope for a cooperative attitude by the Soviet Union toward terrorism.

Historically, the Soviet Union's association with a number of states who are known to be centers of terrorism is -- gives one no great cause for optimism. That said, to answer your question, yes, it will be on the agenda, and our purpose will be to try to engender a change in Soviet attitudes toward this problem and that curtailment of their support for countries that do engage in it.

Q Mr. McFarlane, you said in your press conference just now that the President is prepared to discuss the Middle East and the Gulf War in his discussions with the Soviets. This was not the attitude of President Reagan when he made his speech in the United Nations, and he mentioned only 5 points of regional problems -- not included the Middle East. Is there any reason for this change?

MR. MCFARLANE: The President is prepared to discuss regional issues in a very global sense. His proposal at the United Nations was oriented toward existing conflicts where people are dying today and which -- in which the conflict is being sustained in whole or in part by Soviet support to one side or another, and where the prospect for self-determination is foreclosed, really, by that outside support. That said, focusing on them was because they are more urgent, because there are existing wars that hold the promise of expanding. It is not to say that we aren't prepared to talk about other regional issues, too, which we are. And I would expect in that sense that we are ready to talk about the Middle East, the Persian Gulf -- every global or regional issue we are ready to discuss. It was in that sense that I commented.

Q Mr. McFarlane, you've just said that it would be useful to have cooperation in the fight against terrorism. The President of the United States said correct words that terrorists are guilty for hijacking airplanes should be handed over to the state which has jurisdiction so that they may be punished.

This was said after the United States had forced an Egyptian aircraft to land. From the beginning of the '70's, the United States have harbored two criminals -- a father and a son -- Brazinkas, who had hijacked a Soviet aircraft and murdered a 19 year-old stewardess -- N. Kurchinka her name was. Perhaps the United States might follow their own appeal and also the advice of the President of the United States and could hand those criminals back to the Soviet Union. Thank you, sir.

MR. MCFARLANE: I think that the United States abhorrence for hijacking, for any other form of terrorism, is surely as emphatic as in any country. That's been a matter of consistent U.S. policy throughout our history. The instance that you mention is one in which people who are charged with violations of law in other countries and who are in the United States availing themselves of our judicial process have, because they can, exercise the free access to judicial remedies, taken time, and that delay is normal associated with our court system and with that of many countries, I would say, who insist upon great care in providing full due process before people are convicted and imprisoned. It doesn't reflect a judgment by the United States one way or the other on the guilt or innocence of those people. It is the nature of our judicial process and that it isn't a position in which our government intervenes or takes a position.

Q To follow up -- but they hijacked Soviet plane and they killed Soviet hostess.

MR. MCFARLANE: The determination of their guilt or innocence is a matter that we leave to our courts and, ultimately, to other courts where they may be charged. So, I can't comment on whether they are guilty or innocent. We do avail anybody in our country of due process.

Q Mr. McFarlane, going back to the incident with that young lady which arose out of the fact that this morning at the airport she asked -- during the speech of Gorbachev, she asked him whether he would release Sakharov. Do you think that this sort of thing -- her asking that question -- and she carried the credential of, I understand, a respected Dutch newspaper -- can do the slightest harm or damage to the summit?

MR. MCFARLANE: Well, I think that the exercise of basic freedoms can never be truly harmful. I think people who live in free countries are used to the expression of the individual views and, as long as they're expressed in ways that don't detract from those of others, that's life.

Q This is a side issue of terrorism -- it's the mission of Mr. Waite. There are reports that he is going back to Beirut and prepared to conduct some sort of shuttle. One, do you know that this is the case, and two, are we -- are you doing anything that might be construed by the kidnappers to be negotiating?

MR. MCFARLANE: We were to have been in touch today with Mr. Waite in London and I have to say I haven't gotten a report upon those exchanges and so I couldn't really confirm or deny it, because I don't know whether Mr. Waite has headed back or not. We have supported his efforts. Through him we have made clear, as we've said publicly, that we've always been willing to communicate with the captors of our hostages to exchange views, to hear their complaints, and to reaffirm, personally, our own policies. Now, that is different from changing our policy and we don't intend to do that, nor to make concessions to terrorists, but we will communicate, yes.

Q During the summit, will Mr. Reagan take and table the oppressions against the Turks in Bulgaria?

MR. MCFARLANE: The President will deal with as many

MORE

issues as it possible. I couldn't promise that that will be treated, but he's conscious of the situation and he wants to get as much done as he can here.

Q Mr. McFarlane -- I would like to ask you one question. How would you view such a situation that if a Soviet Union will support a person who will break your press conferences here or will break the President Reagan's speech at the airport. I think that lady who's right for freedom you defended here has the support from the United States because you support such so-called freedom fighters.

MR. MCFARLANE: I don't mean to be contentious in saying this, but I think people in free countries espouse and support and acknowledge that people have an inherent right to express their point of view and this person is not someone who is doing something put up or inspired by the United States. Our government has nothing to do with this person. She is a free human being.

Q Could you give us some information about the meeting between President Reagan and Swiss President Furgler?

MR. MCFARLANE: The meeting was a very cordial one in which President Reagan had the opportunity to express his deep gratitude and respect with the Swiss Confederation and for its hosting of this meeting with the General Secretary. He has well expressed his great respect for Switzerland's historic role over time in being seen as and being, in fact, a country devoted to the resolution of problems, to being a country quite capable, not only at peacekeeping, peacemaking, but at humanitarian undertakings and he mentioned, in particular, the founding of the Red Cross.

The meeting also encompassed the bilateral relationship between the United States and Switzerland which is quite good. A few issues were

treated in particular to include the civil air service and a pending negotiation for expanding air service between Switzerland and the United States; also, matters on technology transfer, and of information access, and so forth. Each of these proceeding amicably toward resolution. And both Presidents expressed pleasure at that.

The Swiss President provided his very strong encouragement to the talks to be held in the coming days and his wish that they can produce an outcome that includes a reduction of tensions and over time the settlement of disagreements. It was a very harmonious meeting, pleasant. The President parted, again expressing his deep thanks for President Furgler, his colleagues, and of his country as hosts.

Q To change the subject, may I have your comment on the letter of Mr. Weinberger which was printed in the American press before reaching the President?

MR. MCFARLANE: The Secretary's letter was in response to a request from the President this past June that he evaluate Soviet compliance and make recommendations as to whether their violations had created additional threats or an expanded threat to the United States and our allies, and if that were the case, what should be done about it. The first part of the report, which is attached to the letter you mentioned, has been received. A second part, which will be the recommendations based upon these findings, will be received after the President's return.

When he made this request in June, the President said, please look at the compliance record, take into account the Soviet good faith in the Geneva arms talks. In addition, take into account Soviet building programs and additional offensive systems and integrate all of that into recommendations on what to do. That material will be staffed, and the views of all appropriate Cabinet officers heard. And I expect the President would make decisions within a month or so.

Q Is the issue of the Soviet -- of the Jewish emigration from the Soviet Union a cornerstone in opening the Middle East file here for you? Is it a precondition? And, secondly, on Afghanistan, there has been talk of guarantees, as you know, in the UN plan for Soviet-Afghanistan problem by the Security Council members. And I don't know what your position towards guarantees of the status of Afghanistan, once the UN plan is implemented.

SENIOR ADMINISTRATION OFFICIAL: On the first question, the United States' position toward Soviet participation and the resolution of Middle East problems doesn't have any preconditions on it per se, related to Jewish emigration, nor to restoration of relations, nor to any other precondition.

That said, we believe that it's reasonable to expect that any country -- the Soviet Union or anyone else -- who wishes to participate in a peace process not be supportive of those who are most opposed to it. Consequently, the current Soviet position, supporting as it does the extremist elements who are devoted to resisting that process, seems to disqualify them from a constructive role.

Concerning Afghanistan, the United States reference to guarantees has been in the context of possible guarantees we might make with the Soviet Union if they are interested. After the internal parties to the struggle -- the Afghan freedom fighters and the client government there engage together and talk to each other and come to terms, it's possible that we might be helpful in providing some kind of guarantees there. We do indeed support the United Nations efforts -- the Cordobas mission -- and don't wish to interfere with that in any way. If we can be helpful afterward or in a separate context, we'd be glad to.



Q I would like to ask, do you think during this meeting the United States is going to have some answer to stop the Nicaraguan problem, to stop the Nicaraguan invasion to Central America and expansion of the socialist regime in Central America?

MR. MCFARLANE: Well put. I think surely the United States will take up that issue and express our views very clearly on our concern on the issue as you cast it, and that is, the expansion of subversion from Nicaragua as a base and with its support in neighboring countries. Yes, that will surely be on the agenda. We would hope for progress and it depends upon good faith interest on the part of the Soviet Union.

Q Will you reject beforehand any linkage on regional issues between Afghanistan and Nicaragua? There was talk of an idea for a deal saying that if the Soviets are willing to retrieve their troops from Afghanistan and advisors or Cuban advisors in Nicaragua you could decide to stop funding the Contras in Nicaragua. Is any kind of linkage like this completely out of the discussion at this point?

MR. MCFARLANE: I don't really think there is a correspondence there between the situation in Nicaragua and Afghanistan, and therefore I don't think that there is a basis for linkage as you put it. The United States has no combat forces in either country. The United States has taken a position that it supports those who ask nothing more than pluralism, self-determination, and we support those with that stance. The Soviet Union has over 100,000 troops in Afghanistan, over 1,000 Soviet advisors and so forth in Nicaragua, a total of 10,000 bloc Cuban Soviet personnel there. We call for their departure, for the reduction of the Nicaraguan military to a level that is no greater than that of its neighbors, of a severance of the military ties with the Soviet Union and Cuba, and of a commitment, hopefully, to stop exporting this subversion to neighboring states.

Q The American position seems to be that the Afghan people have the right to self-determination because they are under occupation according to the U.S. position. Doesn't that same principle apply to the Palestinian people who have been under occupation since 1967?

MR. MCFARLANE: The United States has always supported self-determination for all peoples. It has taken on a special connotation in the Palestinian context as you know, where it is explicitly linked to the formation of an independent Palestinian state. President Reagan doesn't believe that that is the most stable approach to the resolution of the Palestinian problem. He expressed his views in September of 1982, and they have not changed since.

However, it is less important what American views are and more important what is negotiated between the parties themselves -- in this case, Jordan. Palestinian participation is surely anticipated in direct talks with the government of Israel. That's what we're trying to achieve now.

Q Mr. McFarlane, could you tell us the criterias on which you personally would decide on Wednesday evening whether the summit was a success or a failure.

MR. MCFARLANE: Well, I don't mean to be frivolous, but I would decide on Wednesday evening that it had succeeded if a year from now there were peace, a more stable relationship, reduction of arms, expanded cooperation between the U.S. and the Soviet Union. And one simply won't know this Wednesday if any of those conditions we'll obtain. And so you can't pronounce the outcome as good or bad until you have seen whether the parties leave and are better able to solve problems than when they came.

Now, there may be a measure of agreement on certain issues and we welcome that -- we want to get as much agreement as we can, but let's not pretend that smiles and good faith commitments are as important as deeds and actions. And that's what we're looking for -- a commitment to a pattern of behavior that is consistent with fundamental international law and the principle of the peaceful resolution of disputes.

Q Can you tell us whether there are any peculiarities in the ground rules tomorrow for the meeting with the two leaders? Will both of them use simultaneous translation?

MR. MCFARLANE: The ground rules for the American-hosted session is that there will be simultaneous translation. I am told that that is also in agreement with the Soviet Union for when they host on Wednesday, so for all sessions, simultaneous.

Q Mr. McFarlane, recently in an interview with 4 Soviet journalists, President Reagan stated that the invasion of Grenada came about as a result of an invitation by the government. I think it's a view that you also repeated yesterday. I was in Grenada at the time of the invasion. Is it not true that the so-called invitation came from the Governor General of the country who was their representative of the Queen of England and not the head of the government of Grenada. And secondly, do you intend, or does the President intend to include the problems in South Africa in your discussions on regional issues?

MR. MCFARLANE: On the first question concerning Grenada, you're quite right. It was Governor General Scoon that made the request. He was reinforced by that by several state members of the East Caribbean community. But that is quite right, and I believe in the President's interview that

was editorially changed because that is what is -- in fact, is what he said in fact. But you're right. The issue of Southern Africa and events there will be on the agenda.

Q Mr. McFarlane, I would like to know the answer to two questions. In the first place, how can the United States talk about Soviet intervention in Nicaragua when the United States finances groups and establishes military bases against Nicaragua and Honduras that is against Nicaragua -- I mean against the government of Nicaragua and against the people who support that government? Why doesn't the United States begin by taking hands off Nicaragua -- that is a first question -- and respect democracy in that country?

The second question is don't you think that the uptake of confrontation East-West limits self determination of several countries in the Third World? That is you cannot -- from my point of view, you cannot always talk about confrontation East-West when government is not allowed to the United States?

MR. MCFARLANE: On the first point, concerning Nicaragua, let's recall that the Sandinista Revolution in 1979 came to power committed formally to the OAS to hold elections provide for pluralism, basic institutions of democracy and that soon thereafter the members of that revolution that held to the Marxist point of view captured the institutions of power and ruled out all of the promises that they had made regarding elections and the free exercise of basic civil liberties. That pattern of behavior has continued, most recently being reconfirmed on October 15th by the extension of the state of emergency which basically deprives the people of almost all civil liberties.

Against that kind of performance, where the Church is limited in what it can do, where labor unions are all but foreclosed, where the press is all but denied, it's not surprising that opposition develops among the Nicaraguan people. This isn't American-inspired. It's a home-grown criticism by Nicaraguans of the subversion of their own revolution.

Those people call for nothing more than a dialogue with the Sandinista government. They simply want to talk to their own people about having elections, and, in fact, what they promised in 1979. If they would do that, the United States would have no problem with it at all.

These people seem to express -- although it's not my judgment to make -- the will of Nicaraguan people to the extent that their ranks are swelling and growing every day. And it appears that the government -- the Sandinista government is having a more and more difficult time in attracting people into its own armed forces.

On the separate point that you make about whether it isn't wrong to cast local problems into an East-West context, I agree with you. We hope, as well, that the Soviet Union won't, by exporting its own ideology, by military power and subversion, do that itself.

The United States seeks the independent, sovereign development of every country. We are willing to be helpful in addition, beyond using weapons alone, which is Soviet policy, but by providing for free trade, economic assistance and the access to the American market of their products.

In the President's formula at the United Nations, our proposal for solving the several existing wars was not to cast them in an East-West area and to call first for the people in each place to talk to each other, without any Soviet or American involvement whatsoever. For I agree with you, these should not be East-West issues. And if the Soviet Union had not made them so by providing military power and physical intervention, they wouldn't be so.

Q Mr. McFarlane, do you think is it possible to reach and fulfill peace in Middle East without dealing with PLO and Mr. Arafat?

MR. MCFARLANE: The Palestinian cause and the resolution of that problem is an issue to which the United States is very strongly devoted.

The PLO approach has been, from the beginning, to rely upon armed struggle to establish that identity. And it hasn't worked. In three wars in the course of 15 years, the PLO has been either deserted or damaged badly by violence and still has not succeeded in establishing the identity that it seeks for Palestinians. So we don't think that's the right course. And for as long as the PLO is devoted to terrorism, refuses to recognize Israel or acknowledge the United Nations Resolutions which provide a framework for a solution, we don't see that they are taking a constructive position and we have nothing to say to them.

When the point comes where the PLO renounces violence, acknowledges Israel's right to exist and supports those U.N. Resolutions, 242 and 338, that provides a basis for dialogue.

THE PRESS: Thank you very much.

END

7:20 P.M. (L)