

NATIONAL SECURITY COUNCIL
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20506

October 3, 1985

~~SECRET/SENSITIVE/EYES ONLY~~INFORMATION

MEMORANDUM FOR ROBERT C. MCFARLANE

FROM: JACK MATLOCK *JM*

SUBJECT: Horowitz Conversations with Soviet Official

Larry Horowitz briefed me yesterday in detail regarding meetings he had Sunday and Monday with Andrei Pavlov, who he said works closely with Zagladin in the CPSU Secretariat. Horowitz presumes that the messages were intended not only for Senator Kennedy, but also for passing to us, but he asked that the matter be handled with our usual discretion: that is, that they be shared with you and John Poindexter, and if you deem appropriate, with the President and Secretary Shultz, but not with others. Though it is somewhat disjointed, I will recount Horowitz's report as he gave it to me from his notes.

Background:

Horowitz received a message Friday asking him to come urgently to meet with Pavlov in Helsinki to discuss matters which they had discussed during his visit to Moscow in July. (These had included a Soviet invitation for Kennedy to visit Moscow, which Kennedy had refused unless the Soviets would agree to release both Sakharov and Shcharansky.) At first Horowitz resisted the idea of travelling suddenly to Helsinki, but was told that there was a positive answer to the Senator's requests, and he therefore decided he should go.

Horowitz arrived in Helsinki Sunday and was met by Pavlov. The latter refused to talk in Horowitz's hotel, and they went instead to a Lutheran Church, sat through the latter part of the evening service in the balcony, and stayed there for more than an hour's conversation afterward. On Monday, the conversations took place in a room in a hotel different from the one Horowitz was staying in, by Pavlov's prearrangement. Pavlov explained these bizarre arrangements -- and the selection of Helsinki rather than Moscow for the meeting -- by saying that they had to be away from both Soviet and American listening devices. In fact, he seemed to be concerned primarily about Soviet devices, since he claimed that "not all elements" of the Soviet government were aware of the contact, and that if the meetings had occurred in Moscow, the circle of people who were witting might be inadvertently widened.

DECLASSIFIED

NLRR FD6-714/3 #7875~~SECRET/SENSITIVE/EYES ONLY~~BY CN NARA DATE 10/30/07

SECRET/SENSITIVE/EYES ONLY

Invitation to Kennedy:

It turned out that Horowitz was misled regarding the "favorable answer." Pavlov did give him a letter from Gorbachev ~~from~~ the Senator -- which Horowitz described as "pap," and had the chutzpah to suggest that the Senator release it to the press. Horowitz told him that the Senator never released private correspondence to the press. Horowitz said that the obvious Soviet desire is for Kennedy to visit Moscow -- if possible before November 19 -- but that Kennedy is aware of the danger of being used as a tool and will not agree, unless he can get both Sakharov and Shcharansky out as part of the bargain. He has already been assured of lectures before student groups, a TV appearance and other such goodies.

The message regarding Sakharov and Shcharansky was, however, negative. Instead, the Senator was offered thirty exit visas for some rank-in-file refuseniks. Horowitz said he refused this on the spot as an adequate step to induce Kennedy to visit.

Pavlov's Spiel

Most of the conversation, however, was devoted to a review by Pavlov of recent developments in Soviet-American relations. He made these comments on the basis of written instructions and insisted that Horowitz take notes. Pavlov's comments went as follows:

Human Rights:

Gorbachev sent his personal greetings to Senator Kennedy and considered it important to prepare for a possible meeting with the Senator. Conditions have been changing since July. The optimism of the summer has passed. The cause of human rights was set back by the "disastrous" Shultz-Shevardnadze meeting in Helsinki. Shevardnadze felt deeply insulted by the fact that Shultz confronted him with human rights questions in their first private meeting. Being new to the game, he did not expect Shultz to put him on the spot. When this was reported to the Politburo, the entire body was incensed and a decision was made to make no concessions whatever in this area. In particular, a decision was made that Sakharov will not be released in the foreseeable future. (In response to Horowitz's question, Pavlov said that this decision did not apply to Shcharansky.)

The Shultz-Shevardnadze Helsinki Meeting:

The Soviet side made all possible efforts to put things on the right track. They exercised restraint in bilateral relations and told Shultz they are ready to consider joint statements on non-proliferation, chemical weapons, and confidence-building measures. They also are making new proposals in the Geneva negotiations. However, they have no intention of placing major

SECRET/SENSITIVE/EYES ONLY

~~SECRET/SENSITIVE/EYES ONLY~~

emphasis on bilateral issues, as distinct from world problems, at the Geneva summit meeting.

Shultz's response to this was that areas of international security and human rights are indispensable. He also made reference to the Nicholson case, which he said was not closed, to Berlin air corridors, to flights over oil rigs in the Bering Sea, and stressed that they Soviets must exercise restraint in all areas. He also stressed the need for verification. He said that it is impossible to negotiate on space weapons and complained about Soviet contacts with Congressmen, Congressional staffers and the Union of Concerned Scientists. [On this point, Horowitz wondered if the Soviets thought we were complaining about his contacts. I explained to him that what Shultz had said was that they were sending messages by Congressmen like Steve Solarz and letters to the Union of Concerned Scientists suggesting positions which were not conveyed at the negotiating table, and that we could not take official notice of "proposals" which were not made officially.] Finally, Shultz was quoted as saying that we absolutely disagree with any connection among the three areas under negotiation in Geneva.

Regarding space weapons, Shultz had asked Shevardnadze if it would be possible for us to work together on space weapons. In effect, this was tantamount to saying, "Let's do away with the ABM Treaty." The Soviet side felt a shiver of real danger. This seemingly innocent statement by the Secretary of State shocked Shevardnadze to the core.

While the Shultz-Shevardnadze meeting was considered an unmitigated disaster, they were encouraged by the Nitze-Kvitsinsky "secret meeting" in Helsinki. Nitze had told Kvitsinsky that they had to reduce the warheads on their heavy ICBM's by at least 50%, and if they did this "the question of other systems could be solved." While he had made clear that the U.S. would not agree to ban SLCM's, he had indicated that "nothing is impossible regarding space weapons if ICBM warheads are cut at least fifty percent."

Developments in August:

Since the Helsinki meeting there has been no real progress. The visit of Senator Byrd and his associates was "a joke." The Soviets could not understand why the United States would send a former member of the Ku Klux Klan to represent it. Byrd's comments were "so bad" that two of the senators in the group took Alexandrov aside to say that Byrd did not speak for them. The Soviets do not know what to make of such behavior on the part of the Americans.

Matters have not moved either in Stockholm or in Vienna at the MBFR talks. Even talks on Aeroflot have been stymied by a demand that the Soviets allow planes to fly "rescue missions" over their territory. [Note: I have no idea what this might refer to.]

~~SECRET/SENSITIVE/EYES ONLY~~

~~SECRET/SENSITIVE/EYES ONLY~~

Geneva Negotiations

So far as the Geneva negotiations are concerned, the Soviets see very clearly the American strategy. A few days ago they were told very privately by a senior member of the American delegation that the third round should be very short since little was to be expected. The U.S. position can be summed up as: (1) a substantial reduction of strategic offensive weapons; (2) enhanced verification; and (3) agreement on the increasing importance of defensive systems. Outside these three areas there seems to be no possibility of compromise. As a result of this assessment, the Soviets have concluded that the U.S. wants to abandon the ABM Treaty.

Shultz-Dobrynin Meeting, September 10

Secretary Shultz met with Dobrynin September 10 and, when the question of an agreed statement at the Geneva summit was raised, was non committal. He said we should wait and see what develops. Also, Lesley Gelb told Dobrynin that the summit would be a complicated one with unclear results. Reagan would fight for his SDI because he was emotionally committed to it. Also there might be unpleasant moves in regard to Soviet offices and personnel in the U.S., but this should not disturb the summit. [Note: Horowitz is as nonplussed as I am over how Gelb's comments, whatever they might have been, are relevant to the point they were making. Maybe it was a way of suggesting that well-informed Americans do not believe that the President is serious -- and that he is in fact planning further "challenges."]

The General Secretary wanted the Senator to understand that "such a success" will not be permitted. There is zero chance of any practical agreements at the summit if space weapons are not addressed.

Shevardnadze's Proposal to the President

Regarding Shevardnadze's meeting with the President Friday, a letter had been delivered to the President with a proposal which takes into account American suggestions. The most important point is that there must be a ban on space strike weapons. Research is all right. Anything inside laboratories is OK, but nothing outside labs is OK. The Soviets will propose in Geneva a 50% reduction of launchers, which will leave the U.S. with the greater number, and they will agree to reduce all types of systems. Everything is negotiable, including the percentage of land-based missiles, but everything that can reach the other side must be counted. Re medium-range missiles, the Soviets will bring their numbers down to the British and French level. The number of planes in Europe can be reduced to 300-400 on each side. The Soviets are willing to reduce land-based ICBM's by a full 50% They are proposing this because Nitze said that if the reduction is of this magnitude, the U.S. would discuss SDI. The Soviets also will propose an agreement to ban testing and

~~SECRET/SENSITIVE/EYES ONLY~~

SECRET/SENSITIVE/EYES ONLY

deployment of ASAT systems. They are prepared to reach an agreement on the Krasnoyarsk radar. They will stop all construction all allow on-site verification if the U.S. will do the same in respect to Thule and Flylingdale. However, no agreement anywhere is possible without agreement on SDI. The Soviets feel that if the Administration is reasonable, a solution can be found. Everything is negotiable if SDI is included, but nothing is possible if it is not.

Gorbachev's Prognosis

If Gorbachev concludes that the Administration is inflexible on SDI, there will be either a failed summit or no summit at all. Gorbachev's view is that the ABM Treaty is of paramount importance. It lies at the foundation of mutual deterrence and it is of mutual value. It is, furthermore, essential to the security of the Soviet Union. If it collapses, "we are genuinely vulnerable."

Dobrynin's Status

During the conversation, Pavlov remarked at one point that it had been decided some time back that Korniyenko should replace Dobrynin in Washington. However, Korniyenko's wife had fallen ill and he could not leave Moscow. However, the general feeling is that Dobrynin has been in Washington long enough and he is likely to be replaced early next year. So far as Pavlov was aware, no final decision had been made regarding his successor.

COMMENT:

1. It seems obvious that the principal Soviet motivation in this contact is to pass their point of view to Senator Kennedy. Their understanding of American politics is so distorted that it is entirely possible that they view him as the leading Democrat and the likely Democratic candidate (and possible winner) in 1988. This would explain their efforts both to inform him of events in a way designed to put the Administration in a bad light (they actually probably think their account does so!) and at the same time inveigle him into coming to Moscow in a blatant "splitting" maneuver. I judge from Horowitz's comments that the Senator is aware of this, and recognizes the dangers to his own position if he plays along. However, I cannot be absolutely confident on this score, since Horowitz said as he was leaving that if the Senator could get a deal on Sakharov and Shcharansky, he would feel "morally bound" to go in order to secure their release.

The elements of Horowitz's conversations relating to the possibility of a Kennedy visit are obviously the most sensitive ones in Horowitz's account. Horowitz said that the Senator wanted you personally to be aware of what was going on, but would appreciate your not conveying this particular information to

SECRET/SENSITIVE/EYES ONLY

~~SECRET/SENSITIVE/EYES ONLY~~

anyone else (except, presumably, the President). Despite some of the deeply disturbing implications here, I believe it important that we respect Horowitz's request for discretion.

2. It is hard to determine how many of the distortions in Pavlov's account are calculated ones, designed to make points with Kennedy, and how much -- if any -- expresses genuine perceptions. I suspect that there is more disinformation than genuine insight here.

3. Nevertheless, this latest report is a reminder that it would be useful to have a channel to discuss some of these things candidly and directly, just in case some of the misperceptions are genuine.

4. The dramatic language used to describe the importance to Soviet security of the ABM Treaty is interesting. If there is any grain of truth in it, it suggests that we may have some leverage here.

5. Finally, I would note that there was no bragging about great expectations for Gorbachev's trip to Paris, as there was in the July presentation given Horowitz, and also no repeat of the threat voiced in July that there would be a vigorous program of Soviet deployments if the Geneva meeting were deemed unsuccessful.

~~SECRET/SENSITIVE/EYES ONLY~~