

ARTICLE APPEARED IN  
PAGE A6

NEW YORK TIMES  
5 November 1985

# Excerpts From Reagan's Interview With 4 Soviet Journalists

Special to The New York Times

WASHINGTON, Nov. 4 — Following are excerpts from President Reagan's interview last Thursday with four Soviet journalists, as recorded and transcribed by the White House Press Office and made public today. The material in italics, between brackets, was omitted from Russian and English transcripts of the interview published in the Soviet Union.

## OPENING STATEMENT

[May I welcome you all. And I appreciate very much the opportunity to be able to speak, in a sense, to the people of your country. I've always believed that a lot of the ills of the world would disappear if people talked more to each other instead of about each other. So I look forward to this meeting and welcome your questions.]

## New Soviet Proposal

Q. Mr. President, we have become acquainted with the answers which you furnished to our written questions. They basically reflect the old U.S. proposals. They have been evaluated — which have been evaluated by the Soviet side as being unbalanced and one-sided in favor of the U.S. side. And you have not answered concerning the new Soviet proposal. And this reply to the new Soviet proposal is what is of greatest interest before the meeting in Geneva.

A. When this interview is over, later this afternoon at 3 P.M., I will be making a statement to our own press — well, to all the press — to the effect that we have been studying the Soviet proposal and tomorrow in Geneva, our team at the disarmament conference will be presenting our reply which will be a proposal that reflects the thinking of the original proposal that we had, but also of this latest. Indeed, it will show that we are accepting some of the figures that were in this counterproposal by the General Secretary.

[There are some points in which we have offered compromises between some figures of theirs and some of ours. But that will all be — all those figures will be available tomorrow, and I will simply be stating today that we have — that that is going to take place tomorrow in Geneva. But it is a detailed counterproposal that — to a counterproposal, as is proper in negotiations, that will reflect, as I say, the acceptance on our part of some of this latest proposal as well as compromises with earlier figures that we'd proposed.]

## U.S. Public Opinion

Q. I would like to have another question for you, Mr. President. According to a survey taken by The Washington Post and ABC on Tuesday, it was found that 74 percent of the American people as compared to 20 percent said that they would like the U.S. and the Soviet Union to reduce their nuclear arsenals and not have the U.S. develop space weapons. This seems to be the choice which the American people have made. It seems clear that without stopping the development of weapons in space there can be no reduction of nuclear weapons. This is the position of the Soviet side. So how then will you react, Mr. President, to this opinion expressed by the American public?

A. For one thing, it is based on a misconception. The use of the term "Star Wars" came about when one political figure in America used that to describe what it is we are researching and studying, and then our press picked it up and it has been worldwide. We're not talking about "Star Wars" at all. We are talking about seeing if there isn't a defensive weapon that does not kill people, but that simply makes it impossible for nuclear missiles, once fired out of their silos, to reach their objective — to intercept those weapons.

Now it is also true that, to show that this is a misconception on the part of the people when you use the wrong terms, not too long ago there was a survey taken, a poll of our people, and they asked them about "Star Wars." And similar to the reaction in this poll, only about 30 percent of the people in our country favored it, and the rest didn't. But in the same poll they then described, as I have tried to describe, what it is we are researching — a strategic defensive shield that doesn't kill people, but would allow us one day — all of us — to reduce — get rid of nuclear weapons. And over 90 percent of the American people favored our going forward with such a program.

[Now this is one of the things that we will discuss. We are for, and have for several years now, been advocating a reduction in the number of nuclear weapons. It is uncivilized on the part of all of us to be sitting here with the only deterrent to war — offensive nuclear weapons that in such numbers that both of us could threaten the other with the death and the annihilation of millions and millions of each other's people.]

[And so that is the deterrent that is supposed to keep us from firing these missiles at each other. Wouldn't it make a lot more sense if we could find — that as there has been in history for every weapon a defensive weapon. Weapon isn't the term to use for what we are researching. We are researching for something that could make it, as I say, virtually impossible for these missiles to reach their targets. And if we find such a thing, my proposal is that we make it available to all the world. We don't just keep it for our own advantage.]

## Space Shield

Q. Mr. President, with the situation as it stands today in the international arena, attempts to create such a space shield will inevitably lead to suspicion on the other side that the country creating such a space shield will be in a position to make a first strike. This is a type of statement whose truth is agreed to by many people. Now, it's apparent that the American people have indicated their choice, that if it comes down to a choice between the creation of such a space system and the decrease in nuclear arms, they prefer a decrease in nuclear arms. So, it seems to be a realistic evaluation on the part of the American people. And I would like to ask how the American Government would react to the feeling of the American people in this regard.

A. In the first place, yes, if someone was developing such a defensive system and going to couple it with their own nuclear weapons — offensive weapons — yes, that could put them in a position where they might be more likely to dare a first strike. But your country, your Government has been working on this same kind of a plan beginning years before we ever started working on it, which, I think, would indicate that maybe we should be a little suspicious that they want it for themselves.

But I have said, and am prepared to say at the summit, that if such a weapon is possible, and our research reveals that, then, our move would be to say to all the world, "Here, it is available." We won't put this weapon — or this system — in place, this defensive system, until we do away with our nuclear missiles, our offensive missiles. But we will make it available to other countries, including the Soviet Union, to do the same thing.

[Now, just what — whichever one of us comes up first with that defensive system, the Soviet Union or us or anyone else — what a picture if we say no one will claim a monopoly on it. And we make that offer now. It will be available for the Soviet Union, as well as ourselves.]

And if the Soviet Union and the United States both say we will eliminate our offensive weapons, we will put in this defensive thing in case some place in the world a madman some day tries to create these weapons again — nuclear weapons — because, remember, we all know how to make them now. [So, you can't do away with that information. But we would all be safe knowing that if such a madman project is ever attempted there isn't any of us that couldn't defend ourselves against it.]

So, I can assure you now we are not going to try and monopolize this, if such a weapon is developed, for a first-strike capability.

## U.S. Troops Abroad

Q. Mr. President, I would like to ask you about some of the matters which concern mutual suspicion and distrust. And you indicated at your speech at the United Nations that the U.S. does not extend — does not have troops in other countries — but there are — has not occupied other countries. But there are 550,000 troops — military personnel outside of the United States. In 32 countries, there are 1,500 military bases. So, one can see in this way which country it is that has become surrounded. And you have agreed that the Soviet Union has the right to look out for the interest of its security. And it is inevitable that the Soviet Union must worry about these bases which have — which are around it.

The Soviet Union, in turn, has not done the same. So, how do you in this respect anticipate to create this balance of security which you have spoken about?

A. Well, I can't respond to your exact numbers there that you've given. I don't have them right at my fingertips as to what they are. But we're talking about two different things — we're talking about occupying a country with foreign troops, such as we see the Soviet Union doing in Afghanistan, and there are other places, too — Angola, South Yemen, Ethiopia.

Yes, we have troops in bases. The bulk of those would be in the NATO forces — the alliance in Europe along the NATO line — [there in response to even superior numbers of Warsaw pact troops that are aligned against them.] And the United States, as one of the members of the alliance, contributes troops to that NATO force.

The same is true in Korea in which, at the invitation of the South Korean Government, we have troops to help them there because of the demilitarized zone and the threatening nature of North Korea, [which attacked them without warning. And that was not an American war, even though we provided the most of the men. That war was fought under the flag of the United Nations. The United Nations found North Korea guilty of aggression in violation of the Charter of the U.N. And, finally, South Korea was defended and the North Koreans were defeated. But they still have maintained a sizable, threatening offensive force.]

Other places — we have bases in the far Pacific; we've had them for

many years in the Philippines. We lease those — those are base we rent. In fact, we even have a base that is leased on Cuba that was there long before there was a Castro — a naval base. But this, I think, is a far cry from occupying other countries, [including the nations in the Warsaw pact. They never were allowed the self-determination that was agreed to in the Yalta Treaty — the end of World War II.]

[So, I think my statement still goes — that there is a difference in occupation and a difference in having bases where they are there in a noncombat situation, and many where they are requested by the parent country.]

## Guantánamo Base

Q. If there's a referendum and the Cuban people decide that the base at Guantánamo should be evacuated, would it be evacuated?

A. No, because the lease for that was made many years ago, and it still has many years to run, and we're perfectly legal in our right to be there. It is fenced off. There is no contact with the people or the main island of Cuba at all.

## Russians in Afghanistan

Q. Mr. President, you have mentioned Afghanistan. I would like to say that in Afghanistan Soviet troops are there at the invitation of the Afghan Government to defend the Afghan revolution against the incursions of forces from abroad that are funded and supported by the United States.

In the United Nations, you have indicated that the United States has not attempted to use force, but has fostered the process of democracy by peaceful means. How does this reply fit in with the use of force by the United States in many countries abroad, beginning with Vietnam, where seven million tons of weapons were dropped — seven million tons more than were in the Second World War, and, also, Grenada? I ask this not to dwell on the past, but simply to clarify this issue.

A. And it can be clarified, yes.

[First, of all, with regard to Afghanistan, the Government which invited the Soviet troops in didn't have any choice because the Government was put there by the Soviet Union and put there with the force of arms to guarantee. And, in fact, the man who was the head of that Government is the second choice. The first one wasn't satisfactory to the Soviet Union, and they came in with armed forces and threw him out and installed their second choice, who continues to be the governor.]

Now, there are no outside forces fighting in there. But, as a matter of fact, I think there are some things that, if they were more widely known, would shock everyone worldwide. For example, one of the weapons being used against the people of Afghanistan consists of toys — dolls, little toy trucks, things that are appealing to children. They're scattered in the air. But when the children pick them up, their hands are blown off. They are what we call booby-traps. They're like land mines. This is hardly consis-

tent with the kind of armed warfare that has occurred between nations.

Q. Vietnam?

A. Yes, when Vietnam — or let's say, French Indochina — was given up as a colony, an international forum in Geneva, meeting in Geneva, established a North Vietnam and a South Vietnam. [North Vietnam was already governed by a Communist group and had a government in place] during the Japanese occupation of French Indochina. South Vietnam had to start and create a government.

We were invited into — with instructors, to help them establish something they had never had before, which was a military. And our instructors went in in civilian clothes. Their families went with them. And they started with a country that didn't have any military schools or things of this kind to create an armed force for the Government of South Vietnam.

They were harassed by terrorists from the very beginning. Finally, it was necessary to send the families home. Schools were being bombed. There was even a practice of rolling bombs down the aisles of movie theaters and killing countless people that were simply enjoying a movie. And finally, changes were made that our people were allowed to arm themselves for their own protection.

And then, it is true, that President Kennedy sent in a unit of troops [to provide protection.] This grew into the war of Vietnam. [At no time did the allied force — and it was allied; there were more in there than just American troops —] at no time did we try for victory. Maybe that's what was wrong. We simply tried to maintain a demilitarized zone between North and South Vietnam. And we know the result that has occurred now.

And it is all one state of Vietnam. It was conquered in violation of a treaty that was signed in Paris between North and South Vietnam. [We left South Vietnam, and North Vietnam swept down, conquered the country, as I say, in violation of a treaty.]

But this is true of almost any of the other places that you mentioned. We — I've talked so long I've forgotten some of the other examples that you used.

Q. Grenada?

A. What?

Q. Grenada?

A. Grenada. Ah. We had some several hundred young American medical students there. Our intelligence revealed that they were threatened as potential hostages, and the Government of Grenada requested help, military help, not only from the United States, but from the other Commonwealth nations — island nations in the Caribbean — from Jamaica, from Dominica, a number of these others. They in turn relayed the request to us because they did not have armed forces in sufficient strength.

Continued

And, yes, we landed. And we found warehouses filled with weapons, and they were of Soviet manufacture. We found hundreds of Cubans there. There was a brief engagement. We freed the island. And in a very short time, our troops came home after rescuing our students, rescuing the island. [There are no American troops there now.] Grenada has set up a democracy [and is ruling itself by virtue of an election that was held shortly thereafter among the people, and of which we played no part.

[And there is the contrast: the Soviet troops have been in Afghanistan for six years now, fighting all that time. We did what we were asked to do — the request of the Government of Grenada — and came home.]

## '72 ABM Treaty

Q. Mr. President, with relation to the ABM Treaty, which was signed in 1972, Article 5 of that treaty indicates, and I quote, "that each side will not develop a test or deploy antiballistic missile components or systems which are sea-based, air-based, space-based or mobile land-based. Now, some Administration representatives say that the treaty is such that it permits all of these things — the development, the testing, and deployment of ABM systems. Such an interpretation of that treaty certainly cannot help achieve agreement.

What is the true position of the American Administration with regard to the interpretation of this treaty? Will the U.S. abide by the treaty or not? And certainly the results of your meeting with General Secretary Gorbachev will depend a great deal on that fact.

A. There are two varying interpretations of the treaty. There is an additional clause in the treaty that would seem to be more liberal than that Paragraph 5 — or Clause 5. The other hand, we have made it plain that we are going to stay within a strict definition of the treaty. And what we are doing with regard to research — and that would include testing — is within the treaty.

Now, with regard to deployment, as I said earlier, no, we are doing what is within the treaty and which the Soviet Union has already been doing for quite some time, same kind of research and development. But, when it comes to the deployment, I don't know what the Soviet Union was going to do when and if their research developed such a weapon, or still if it does.

But I do know what we're going to do and I have stated it already. [We would not deploy — my — it is not my purpose for deployment — until we sit down with the other nations of the world, and those that have nuclear arsenals, and see if we cannot come to an agreement on which there will be deployment only if there is elimination of the nuclear weapons.]

Now, you might say if we're going to eliminate the nuclear weapons, then why do we need the defense? Well, I repeat what I said earlier. We all know how to make them — the weapons, so it is possible that some

## President Gave Interview To Specialists on the U.S.

MOSCOW, Nov. 4 (AP) — The four journalists chosen for President Reagan's interview with Soviet reporters are all experts on the United States.

The four men, in their 50's or early 60's, speak English and have spent several years reporting from the United States.

Three of them — Genrikh Borovik of the Novosti feature syndicate, Stanislav Kondrashov of the Government newspaper Izvestia and Vsevolod Ovchinnikov of Pravda — often appear on Soviet television's weekly current affairs program, "International Panorama," a 45-minute review of world events.

The fourth man, Gennadi Shishkin, is the First Deputy Director General of the Soviet Government press agency, Tass. He writes foreign affairs commentaries for Tass and has served as head of the Tass bureau in New York.

Mr. Borovik, in addition to his journalistic activities, has turned to the theater in recent years. He

is the editor of Teatr, the Soviet Union's theatrical monthly, and is the author of "Agent 00," a satirical play about a Latin American country similar to Chile that has been playing to full houses at Moscow's Mayakovsky Theater. Mr. Borovik, who has served in New York for Novosti, frequently writes on Latin American affairs.

Mr. Kondrashov has reported for Izvestia from both New York and Washington and regularly writes for the paper in Moscow on foreign affairs.

Both he and Mr. Ovchinnikov, who has reported from London and from Tokyo for Pravda, wrote articles about President Reagan's speech last month to the United Nations General Assembly.

Both refrained from personal criticism of Mr. Reagan, but attacked the United States record in international affairs, in line with Soviet criticism of Mr. Reagan's focus on disputed regions as a possible area of Soviet-American cooperation.

day a madman could arise in the world — we were both allies in a war that came about because of such a madman — and therefore, it would be like, in Geneva after World War I, when the nations all got together and said no more poison gas, but we all kept our gasmasks. Well, this weapon, if such can be developed, would be today's gasmask. But we would want it for everyone and the terms for getting it, and the terms for our own deployment would be the elimination of the offensive weapons — a switch to maintain trust and peace between us of having defense systems that gave us security, not the threat of annihilation — that one or the other of us would annihilate the other with nuclear weapons.

So, we will not be violating this treaty at any time, because, as I say, it is not our purpose to go forward with deployment if and when such a weapon proved practical.

Q. Mr. President, we've about run out of time unless you had something in conclusion you wanted to state.

A. Well, I — we haven't covered — I guess I've filibustered on too many of these questions here with lengthy answers. I know you have more questions there. I'm sorry that we haven't time for them.

But I would just like to say that the Soviet Union and the United States — well, not the Soviet Union, let us say Russia and the United States have been allies in two wars. The Soviet Union and the United States, allies in one, the last and greatest war, World War II. Americans and Russians died side by side, fighting the same enemy.

There are Americans buried on Soviet soil. And it just seems to me — and what I look forward to in this meeting with the General Secretary — is that people don't start wars, governments do. And I have a little thing here that I copied out of an article the other day, and the author of the article uttered a very great truth. "Nations do not distrust each other because they are armed. They arm themselves because they distrust each other."

Well, I hope that in the summit maybe we can find ways that we can prove by deed — not just words, but by deeds — that there is no need for distrust between us. And then we can stop punishing our people by using our wherewithal to build these arsenals of weapons instead of doing more things for the comfort of the people.

Q. Thank you very much, Mr. President, and —

A. Thank you.

Q. — It's a pity, sir, too, that there can't be enough time to have your answers for all our questions —

A. Well, all right. O.K.

Q. Thank you, Mr. President.



Associated Press

President Reagan being interviewed Thursday by Soviet journalists. From left: Genrikh Borovik of Novosti, the feature syndicate; Gennadi Shishkin of Tass,

the Government press agency; Stanislav Kondrashov of Izvestia, the Government newspaper, and Vsevolod Ovchinnikov of Pravda, the Communist Party daily.

Q. Unfortunately, Mr. President, we cannot discuss with you the history of questions which we just asked already because we have sometimes a very different attitude of that. But no time.

Q. As you know, the world is sort of different.

A. [I was waiting for a question that would allow me to point out that, under the détente that we had for a few years, during which we signed the SALT I and the SALT II Treaties, the Soviet Union added over 7,000 warheads to its arsenal. And we have fewer than we had in 1969. And 3,800 of those were added to the arsenal after the signing of SALT II. So—]

Q. But —

Q. But still you have more warheads —

A. No, we don't.

Q. — Mr. President —

A. Oh, no we don't.

Q. Yes, you have — well, to 12,000—

Q. You know, it's an interesting phenomenon because in '79, after seven years of very severe — I would say the — researching in — SALT II, the — President Carter and other specialists told that there was a parity in strategic and military. And then you came to the power and they said — you said it sounded that the Soviet Union is much ahead. Then, recently, in September, you said almost the same, though the Joint Chiefs of Staffs told this year that there is a parity. What is the contradiction?

A. No, there really isn't. Somebody might say that with the sense of that we have sufficient for a deterrent, that, in other words, we would have enough to make it uncomfortable if someone attacked us. But, no, your arsenal does out-count ours by a great number.

Q. People say that — (inaudible.) (Laughter.) The generals — your generals say they wouldn't —

Q. O.K.

Q. — Switch, you know, with our generals, your arsenal.

Q. I would like to tell you also that those stories about dolls in Afghanistan. I was in Afghanistan there a little bit —

Larry, Speakes, White House spokesman. He's — maybe we'll have another opportunity —

Q. Yes, we hope so.