



United States Department of State

Washington, D.C. 20520

~~SECRET/SENSITIVE~~

MEMORANDUM OF CONVERSATION

DATE: Tuesday, November 19, 1985
TIME: 3:35 - 4:30 PM
PLACE: Fleur d'Eau (Coffee Room)

PARTICIPANTS

US Side

Secretary Shultz
Mr. McFarlane
Ambassador Nitze
Ambassador Hartman
Ambassador Matlock
Mr. Linhard (NSC)
Mr. Zarechnak (Interpreter)

Soviet Side

Foreign Minister Shevardnadze
Dep. Foreign Min. Korniyenko
Ambassador Dobrynin
Mr. Palazhchenko (Interpreter)

When President Reagan and General Secretary Gorbachev went off together for their private conversation at the boathouse, the remaining group on the US and Soviet side stayed at the main house.

Secretary Shultz indicated to Shevardnadze that the President would be talking to the General Secretary about guidelines for the Geneva negotiations. They would see whether they could stimulate the people there to make some progress. Shultz proposed that he and Shevardnadze not discuss that issue, since it was being discussed by the two leaders.

Shevardnadze agreed.

Shultz indicated that he thought that there were some points of intersection in our positions in Geneva, and that the differences could be narrowed down in the process of negotiation. The President would be talking about those issues in broad terms, but if Shevardnadze did have any ideas which he wished to express on that subject, Shultz would, of course, be glad to hear them.

~~SECRET/SENSITIVE~~

DECL: OADR

296-087 #56

clb

5/16/00

Shevardnadze replied that the General Secretary had stated the basic approach of the Soviet side.

Korniyenko interjected that there should be no SDI and there should be mutual exploration on the basis of the two proposals laid down in Geneva in order to bridge the gaps between them. These were short and good guidelines.

Shultz replied that the Soviet side realized that the US would not stop its research program. But as the President had often said, he would be ready to discuss it, and thought should be given to what we would do if the research proves to be promising.

Shevardnadze asked why this was necessary.

Shultz replied that this offered an opportunity of moving the concept of restraints, of which Shevardnadze had spoke so eloquently at the UN, to a more stable and more humane level. It was also an opportunity for dealing with what the US saw as a destabilizing situation which arose from various aspects of offensive arms, such as their accuracy, power, mobility and so forth. It was these things that lead to the necessity of having a strong shield against them. But the US believed that stability would be increased if this took place not as a result of an arms race, but as a result of cooperation. A one-sided move to defense would be destabilizing, whereas a negotiated move would be stabilizing.

Shevardnadze replied that what Shultz was now proposing was cooperation in an unknown area. He was sorry, but he considered such things to be in the realm of fantasy. If we speak about offensive nuclear arms and their limitation, we have a great deal of experience in this, and US and Soviet proposals are on the table at the negotiations. The General Secretary had indicated today that if we agreed to ban space strike weapons, then on the basis of such proposals the US and USSR could find compromise solutions. This was solid logic.

Shevardnadze continued that Shultz had said that the main destabilizing factor was offensive nuclear arms. In his opinion, the main destabilizing factor today was the US SDI program. If it were not for SDI, the two sides could make progress at the Geneva talks.

Shevardnadze also wished to add something which he had not mentioned before. Shultz had said that in speaking of SDI, US officials had said that the Soviet Union was conducting research in this area as well. And not only was it carrying out research, but was ahead in some areas. This was being said

not only by journalists and the media, but official US representatives as well. If this was so, why is the Soviet side proposing to ban space strike weapons?

Shultz said that the US and the Soviet Union had different views about the Soviet program. The Soviet side had described it in one way, but the US felt confident that Soviet research was approximately parallel to its own, and had been going on for some time. He said that Ambassador Nitze could describe how we see the Soviet program and could give some reasons why it exists.

Before Ambassador Nitze could start, Shevardnadze interjected that if the US side intended to try to convince the Soviet side of the usefulness of the SDI program, with all due respect for Ambassador Nitze, it would not be able to do so. The General Secretary had indicated that the Soviet side had not simply invented its arguments, but had formed them after discussions with scientists and design specialists. It was the conviction of the Soviet side that space strike weapons would be the beginning of a new era of the arms race.

Shevardnadze continued that words to the effect that this process could be regulated by agreement were, in his opinion, baseless, since agreements were made by people, and people could abrogate them as well. Therefore, the wisest decision at present would be not to allow a new cycle of the arms race - the most terrible one.

Shevardnadze continued that perhaps he did not know some of the facts which specialists were aware of in this area. He did not understand how there could be guarantees that defensive weapons would have no offensive function. There were very few weapons of a defensive nature that did not have an offensive function as well.

Korniyenko interjected that the President and other US representatives said that after we find out if we can or cannot create such a system, before deploying it, we will discuss it with other countries. Developing such a system would take many years, and the question was, would the next President follow the same logical arguments that the present one uses? But the arms will be there. They will have their own logic. There will be no way back. Unfortunately, we knew from history examples of treaties which were signed and then thrown into the wastebasket. How could other countries think that 10 or 15 years from now a US administration would act in the way that the present US Administration was asking the USSR to believe that it would act? This was naive.

Shultz said that he would like to reply to these questions, which were good ones. First of all, the US was proposing an "open laboratories" approach which would call for briefings on what was going on in this area, so that the Soviet side would not be suspicious, and doubts would be eliminated. This would call for Soviet scientists to visit US labs and get a feel for this firsthand, so as the process develops, people who understand it, i.e. scientists, would have a sense of what was happening. Secondly, it would be in our interest (not only on the basis of goodwill and trust) to have cooperative defense development which would not be one-sided. The reason that it would be in our interest not to have one-sided defense development is that this would produce instability since it would cause concern on the part of the side that did not do this about what would happen if such a shield were in place. The US side is not interested in instability, so it is not interested in doing things differently from how the President has proposed.

Shultz continued that the third thing was that finally our two sides were talking about reductions, and not just limitations, of offensive arms. This was a long time in coming, but was now on our agenda. This was agreed to in Geneva back in January, where both the US and the USSR proposed reductions. The two sides had indicated at that time, and the President and the General Secretary had repeated, the desire of the sides to reduce their nuclear arsenals to zero. The closer we get to zero, the more the defensive shield can eliminate the offensive threat. It would be an insurance policy, and not a defense which would permit an offensive strike. If both sides begin to reduce their weapons and continue along that path, and other countries join us, we would change the nature of the Soviet concern. Shultz indicated at this point that Mr. McFarlane would like to add about another ten points.

Shevardnadze said that he would like to reply and ask some questions. Today we were talking about reductions of nuclear weapons, including strategic offensive weapons. Let's say we agreed to a 50 percent reduction today and agree to the need to eliminate nuclear weapons altogether. If we seriously took this to its logical conclusion, and other countries joined us, why would there be a need for a shield? We would not only eliminate nuclear weapons, but would have the means to assure that other countries would not have them.

Shultz replied that he was glad that Shevardnadze had added this, since he agreed that verification was an important element in this process.

Mr. McFarlane said that he had some brief comments. Mr. Korniyenko's question was a reasonable one, i.e. whether the

intentions of the present Administration would be shared by future Presidents. No administration could bind future ones. But history had shown that in democracies, specifically in the US, there was a basis on which a judgment could be made. Recent evidence had shown that even where a treaty was not enforced, and there was only an agreement to abide by it, the sides continued to observe it after its scheduled expiration when there was no obligation to do so. This should be a basis for confidence. McFarlane asked Korniyenko if he had perhaps intended to ask about the period of time required for abrogation of the ABM Treaty.

Korniyenko replied that he had not, and said that he had one more question. It might seem strange, and unrelated to the main question under discussion, but he saw a definite tie to this issue. At the beginning of today's session, the President had mentioned, as an example of mistrust (and he had spoken emotionally of how Americans had died in the war), how the USSR, before the end of the war, would not let US planes land on Soviet territory on their bombing missions to Germany. This simply was not true. When enough Soviet territory had been freed, so that the range of the planes would permit them to land for refueling and returning, the Poltava airfield had been opened and was open in 1944 and 1945 as long as the US needed it. He personally had served in the army unit protecting the base. He had been injured and many of his friends had died in defending it. He had known the US commander of the base. And Ambassador Harriman had known of this.

Shevardnadze added that Stalin and Roosevelt had had no differences and we should also not have any.

Korniyenko continued that he had not been offended, but he wondered who gave the President his information if such things were said, not only about this issue, but about other matters as well.

Shultz replied that he was glad to have this information, and the US side would check it out. If the President had been wrong, he would be told. Shultz had heard the President mention this on the basis of the President's Air Force experience.

Shultz continued that he would like to pick up on a different subject and talk about three things which were mentioned, two by the General Secretary and one by Shevardnadze when they had talked previously. Shevardnadze had mentioned that as we worked on ways to express the results of our talks, a number of areas of agreement had been found. This afternoon, the General Secretary had spoken about Afghanistan, and had expressed his opinion that a political settlement of that issue

would be very desirable from the Soviet point of view. The US side agreed with that. Shultz said that he thought that the General Secretary had spoken about Afghanistan in a way which was different from how the subject had been mentioned previously. So, perhaps, this could be a fruitful area for work.

Shultz indicated that among the areas of agreement were the regional consultations (which the General Secretary had mentioned), where the two sides had agreed that they should continue and develop. It was understood that such consultations should go beyond the level of experts, i.e. the Foreign Ministers should meet more regularly, and the questions for discussion should include the processes which might be considered with regard to regional issues such as Afghanistan.

Shultz considered these things to be a plus, and he wanted to add something that the General Secretary had mentioned in the morning session, i.e. he had outlined what he saw as a desirable process of interaction between the two sides in the future. He had spoken of meetings at various levels, starting at the very top, and down to the level of exchanges of citizens. As the Soviet side knew, the US was also in favor of such a concept of interaction. This brought Shultz to the question which they had discussed before, i.e. how to report the results of this meeting in the two countries and to the general public.

Shultz indicated that before leaving Washington he had given Ambassador Dobrynin a document which was based on the document which the two sides had previously worked on. As Shultz had explained to Dobrynin, a proposed paragraph had been added which indicated that the specific areas of agreement were described in the pages following the first one. So there would be a statement of agreement between the two sides concerning the results of the meeting of the two leaders and whatever would come of that, guidelines perhaps, Shultz did not know, perhaps nothing. There were some areas, such as nuclear nonproliferation, where agreement had been reached, and some areas still outstanding. So a possible document indicating such areas of agreement might be worked out. If the Soviet side wished to work on such a document, the US side would be glad to do so. Shultz thought that a meeting could be held at 9:00 PM if the Soviet side agreed.

Korniyenko asked what agreements would be listed after the first page.

Shultz replied that this would depend on what was agreed. There were already quite a number of issues which had been agreed, and perhaps there would be others.

Korniyenko indicated that it was not clear what issues would be listed in addition to the basic guidelines.

Shultz replied that he thought it would be useful for our representatives to work this through, but they would be the kind of things that we had agreed, and on which we had been working, e.g. nonproliferation, a reference to the signing of a cultural agreement, an agreement on North Pacific Air Safety and civil aviation, if they were concluded, a reference to the agreement to continue regional discussions and impetus in this area from the foreign ministers, as well as language on arms control, not only with regard to the Geneva negotiations, but other areas as well. This was a full pot, but it was an attempt to find areas of agreement, not disagreement.

Shevardnadze indicated that Gorbachev had spoken today of the political mechanism which should be in place if our countries wished to cooperate seriously.

Shultz replied that he understood that, and basically, in his previous reference, he had indicated agreement with him, which was reflected here.

Shevardnadze said that he raised this issue since there were different components of this mechanism. The highest component was the meeting of the leaders of the two countries. The second was the meetings between the two foreign ministers, several times a year. Another component was the Geneva negotiations. Another was political consultations on regional issues. There were also meetings on various other issues, such as cultural exchanges, civil aviation, trade, etc.

Shultz added that there were also people-to-people exchanges.

Shevardnadze said that the aim of the present meeting between the two leaders, as the General Secretary had said, was to give a political impetus to all of this. So from the very beginning, the Soviet side had said that we needed to have a serious final document.

Shultz replied that we would try to do this and that there would be a meeting without a fixed agenda between Ambassador Ridgway and Mr. Sokolov about this if the Soviet side wished to have such a meeting.

At this point, it was indicated that the President and the General Secretary had ended their meeting and Gorbachev was leaving. Therefore, Shultz and Shevardnadze concluded their discussion as well.

Drafted: DZarechnak
#3989n