

Ronald Reagan Presidential Library  
Digital Library Collections

---

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

---

**Collection:** Department of State: Office of the Historian:  
Records, 1981-1989

**Series:** IV: PRESS RELEASES

**Folder Title:** March 1985 (1 of 4)

**Box:** 26

---

To see more digitized collections visit:

<https://www.reaganlibrary.gov/archives/digitized-textual-material>

To see all Ronald Reagan Presidential Library Inventories, visit:

<https://www.reaganlibrary.gov/archives/white-house-inventories>

Contact a reference archivist at: **reagan.library@nara.gov**

Citation Guidelines: <https://reaganlibrary.gov/archives/research-support/citation-guide>

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

*Last Updated: 02/08/2024*

# PRESS DEPARTMENT OF STATE



March 1, 1985

No. 33

PROGRAM FOR THE OFFICIAL WORKING VISIT TO WASHINGTON, D.C. OF THE HONORABLE  
BETTINO CRAXI, PRESIDENT OF THE COUNCIL OF MINISTERS OF THE ITALIAN REPUBLIC,  
AND MRS. CRAXI.

March 4 - 7, 1985

Monday, March 4

7:50 p.m.

The Honorable Bettino Craxi, President of the Council of Ministers of the Italian Republic, and his party arrive Andrews Air Force Base via U.S. Presidential Aircraft.

8:00 p.m.

Depart Andrews Air Force Base via motorcade for Embassy Row Hotel, 2015 Massachusetts Avenue, Northwest.

8:30 p.m.

Arrival Embassy Row Hotel.

The Honorable George P. Shultz, Secretary of State, will greet the party on arrival.

Private evening.

Tuesday, March 5

9:00 a.m.

Prime Minister Craxi will meet with The Honorable George P. Shultz, Secretary of State, Embassy Row Hotel, Room 217.

PHOTO COVERAGE: Photographers to be on 2nd floor of hotel no later than 15 minutes before scheduled meeting.

S/CPR - Mary Masserini,  
Embassy Row Hotel - Protocol Office,  
265-1600 Ext. 714.

**For further information contact:**

- 2 -

Tuesday, March 5 (continued)

- 11:30 a.m. Prime Minister Craxi will meet with President Reagan at the White House. At the conclusion of the meeting, President Reagan will host a working luncheon in honor of Prime Minister Craxi at the White House.
- 2:30 p.m. Prime Minister Craxi will hold an Open Press Conference, Embassy Row Hotel, Continental Room.
- PRIME MINISTER CRAXI WILL MEET WITH THE FOLLOWING AT THE EMBASSY ROW HOTEL, ROOM 217:
- 4:30 p.m. The Honorable Malcolm Baldrige, Secretary of Commerce.
- 5:15 p.m. The Honorable John R. Block, Secretary of Agriculture.
- PHOTO COVERAGE: Photographers to be on 2nd floor no later than 15 minutes before scheduled meetings.
- 7:30 p.m. The Honorable George P. Shultz, Secretary of State, and Mrs. Shultz will host a dinner in honor of The Honorable Bettino Craxi, President of the Council of Ministers of the Italian Republic, and Mrs. Craxi, Department of State, Thomas Jefferson Room.
- DRESS: Business suit.

Wednesday, March 6

- 11:00 a.m. Prime Minister Craxi will address a Joint Meeting of Congress, U.S. Capitol.
- 12:00 Noon The National Press Club Members will host a luncheon in honor of Prime Minister Craxi, National Press Club Building, 529 14th Street, Northwest.
- PRIME MINISTER CRAXI WILL MEET WITH THE FOLLOWING AT EMBASSY ROW HOTEL, ROOM 217.
- 2:15 p.m. The Honorable James A. Baker, III, Secretary of the Treasury.
- 5:00 p.m. The Honorable Edwin Meese, III, Attorney General of the United States.

Wednesday, March 6 (continued)

8:15 p.m.

The Honorable Rinaldo Petrignani, Ambassador of Italy, and Mrs. Petrignani will host a dinner in honor of The Honorable Bettino Craxi, President of the Council of Ministers of the Italian Republic, and Mrs. Craxi, at their residence "Firenze House" 2800 Albemarle Street, Northwest.

DRESS: Business suit.

PRESS CONTACT: Mr. Ludovico Ortona,  
Mr. Massimo Basitrocchi,  
328-4760

Thursday, March 7

8:40 a.m.

Prime Minister Craxi, Mrs. Craxi and their party arrive Washington Monument Grounds (Reflecting Pool Side).

9:00 a.m.

Arrival Andrews Air Force Base, Maryland.

9:10 a.m.

Depart Andrews Air Force Base via U.S. Presidential Aircraft for Logan International Airport, Boston, Massachusetts for a private visit.

# PRESS DEPARTMENT OF STATE

March 1, 1985  
No. 34

PC NO. 30



PRESS CONFERENCE  
BY  
THE HONORABLE GEORGE P. SHULTZ  
SECRETARY OF STATE  
Guayaquil, Ecuador  
February 28, 1985

SECRETARY SHULTZ (After reading text of letter from President Reagan to President Febres Cordero on the presentation of the report of President Reagan's Agricultural Task Force to Ecuador) Well, this is the report to the President and I hand it to you with the very best wishes of President Reagan, who remembers his visit with you with great warmth and affection.

PRESIDENT FEBRES CORDERO: (Through translator) I would like to thank Secretary of State Shultz for his visit to Ecuador and also thank him for personally bringing this letter from President Regan, accompanied by the report of the Task Force on Agricultural Production in Ecuador. We have had a lot of cooperation from the United States Government, in coming to our country, and this report that you have just handed us will be very useful for us to work on the problems of agriculture in Ecuador, agriculture having been the traditional backbone of the Ecuadoran economy. I want to thank you for your kindness, also, in coming to visit us here in Ecuador, and your stay, and for the conversations which you have had with us, and for, as I said before, for this very important letter, and the report that it accompanies, from President Reagan. I want to wish you every success in your tenure as Secretary of State of the United States, and ask you to transmit to President Reagan all of our best wishes for his own personal good fortune in his administration and through him, our warmest greetings to our brothers, the people of the United States.

SECRETARY SHULTZ: I want to thank President Febres Cordero for his kind hospitality. I will carry his greetings back to President Reagan. Although my visit here was short, it served the purpose of renewing our two countries' deepening friendship. It also allowed me to become better acquainted with the economic challenges that confront Ecuador, and with the responsible, dedicated approach the administration of President Febres Cordero is taking to meet those challenges. As you know, we will leave shortly for Montevideo and the inauguration of President-elect Sanguinetti. That event will be made all the more gratifying for me by my first-hand experience here of Ecuador's commitment to democracy. I leave Ecuador with the knowledge that our ties are strong, and with a belief that our relations will continue to broaden and deepen, based upon a mutual belief in freedom and in the dignity of the individual.

QUESTION: Mr. Secretary, one of -- the budget deficit of the United States is one of the decisive factors that affects the high interest rates that prevail in the world today, and I would like to ask what measures are being contemplated to be taken during the course of 1985 to reduce that deficit, since as I said it was responsible for the high rates of interest that prevail throughout the world?

SECRETARY SHULTZ: President Reagan is leading a very strong effort to cut expenditures by the Federal Government of the United States. He is cutting the level of expenditures on many programs and proposing the elimination -- total elimination -- of many others. So there is a very strong program under way to reduce the budget deficit of the United States. At the same time, I think you should notice that since President Reagan assumed office, key interest rates, such as what's known as the prime rate, have been cut about in half. And in the last six months or so, there has been a definite decline in interest rates, so that we have seen a gradual fall in interest rates to levels that are still too high, but nevertheless have come down greatly as a result of the policies the President has followed.

QUESTION: Since Nicaragua is one of the difficult problems in the political situation in Central America as far as the United States is concerned, and taking into account the fact that Daniel Ortega, the chief of state of that government, has practically stated -- has publicly stated -- that Nicaragua is inviting the United States to send someone to observe Nicaragua's military arsenal, how is the United States going to react to this public declaration made by Nicaragua and how are they going to react to this offer of

the Government of Nicaragua's apparent offer of peace as far as its relationship with the United States is concerned?

SECRETARY SHULTZ : Well, of course, we're interested in any moves made by Nicaragua that will ease tensions in Central America. And the key things that need to be done are clear: Number one, stop trying to subvert other governments through the support of guerrillas in neighboring states. Number two, reduce the arsenals of weapons and people in military pursuits that are clearly present in Nicaragua as a result of the buildup of the military machine. Number three, the large presence of Soviet and Cuban and eastern bloc forces in Nicaragua is something that needs to be done away with. And fourth, the Government of Nicaragua should do what it has continuously pledged to do, namely, establish a genuinely democratic form of government, as in the case of Ecuador, for example.

QUESTION: How does the United States look upon the process of democratization that we see in Latin America as a means to solving social conflicts in the countries of South and Latin America, and to attenuate the social and political tensions that exist in the area?

SECRETARY SHULTZ: It's one of the most dramatic and important developments in the world, the emergence of democracy in Latin America. In 1979, only about one-third of the people in Latin American lived under conditions that one would call democratic. From that date, 1979 -- a date I'm sure Ecuadoreans remember -- until through March, with the inauguration of a new President in Brazil and Uruguay, that number of one-third will be changed to ninety percent. Ninety percent of the people live under conditions of responsive government. And I think, in the long run, this will be a matter of tremendous importance and more a development toward peace and a development toward creating conditions in individual countries that will benefit the citizens of those countries.

QUESTION: Mr. Secretary, can you please tell us if you have any news about whether you will be having a meeting with Mr. Ortega and also what you think -- how seriously you think his proposal is of sending home 100 Cuban advisors and cutting back on new arms?

SECRETARY SHULTZ: There is no meeting scheduled, but I've read in the newspapers that he is proposing one, and I certainly am prepared to have a meeting. So we'll just have to see about that. Insofar as the proposals, again, which we have heard only through the press, they represent, certainly,

things that may have promise. On the other hand, if you compare one hundred with the thousands of Cuban and Soviet advisers, it's not a very big step. And of course, insofar as any new shipments of armaments are concerned, while it is positive to stop additional shipments, it is important to notice that there has, over the last six months or so, been a concentrated effort to bring in extensive supplies. So by this time, they may have about as much in the way of equipment as they feel they need.

QUESTION: Thank you.

\*\*\*\*\*



# PRESS DEPARTMENT OF STATE



March 4, 1985  
No. 35

INTERVIEW OF  
THE HONORABLE GEORGE P. SHULTZ  
SECRETARY OF STATE  
ON ABC-TV "GOOD MORNING, AMERICA"  
Washington, DC  
March 4, 1985

DAVID HARTMAN: Last week President Reagan said -- talked about removing, I'm quoting, "removing the Nicaraguan government in the sense of its present structure". Exactly what is our government's goal regarding the Government of Nicaragua?

SECRETARY SHULTZ: We want them to change their behavior. We want them to stop supporting insurgencies in other countries, particularly El Salvador where they're seeking to overthrow democratically elected government. We want them to scale their armaments, Soviet supplied armaments down to a level consistent with defense needs in Central America. We want them to adopt a form of government that is more in line with the undertakings they made in the OAS when they had their revolution in the first place. And more in line with the statements of objectives that were put forward in the Contadora statement of objectives. And we want them to remove from their country the large volume of Cuban and Soviet military oriented advisors and trainers.

MR. HARTMAN: Mr. Ortega suggested that they send a hundred Cubans home, that they would stop acquiring new weapons systems, also that they would invite bi-partisan groups from our Congress to come down and look at their military. You suggested these are not particularly significant proposals. Why not?

SECRETARY SHULTZ: Well, in and of themselves, they don't deal in any deep way with the four points that I have just reiterated to you and which we have put forward and the President has put forward consistently over the last three or four years, and I might say which the other Central American countries have put forward over the last three or four years.

MR. HARTMAN: So what then -- realistically, what could come from a new set of talks, given what our government wants and given what they have already suggested they will accept?

SECRETARY SHULTZ: The Contadora principles which they endorsed are perfectly consistent with the points that I have just made. The problem is that Nicaragua doesn't really seem to have any intention of living up to those principles. But the effort being made in the Contadora negotiations is to turn those principles into operational guides so that they might actually work, and we support that.

STEVE BELL: Mr. Secretary, there are other countries around the world that are repressive: South Africa, Chile, just to mention two; and we don't hold the same set of demands to them -- publicly supporting guerrillas in opposition to them. What's the difference?

SECRETARY SHULTZ: As far as South Africa is concerned, we do. And I'll say here, we think, I think the apartheid system is totally repugnant and has no place in the kind of standards that we uphold for ourselves and for others. I might say that you showed the Selma twenty-year anniversary on your news, I noticed this morning, and it shows how difficult it is to change things. Remember we have been around for a long time as a government and still only twenty years ago that could happen. Nevertheless, South Africa should change and we say so publicly and privately and pressure them to do so. The same is true in Chile.

MR. BELL: What we are talking about here is U.S. support for rebels who are fighting against a government that is in power. And the question that so many Americans are asking is how can we justify this? In effect, pressuring somebody else even in the possible overthrow of the government when in the past, some would argue U.S. attempts to do this sort of thing had bad conclusions.

SECRETARY SHULTZ: We have always fought and supported people who are after the freedom and integrity of their own country. And in the case of Nicaragua that is very much the case. The people who are fighting for freedom in Nicaragua are people who are part of the Sandinista revolution and became disenchanted with it. We are not putting those people into place, they are being put there by the actions of the Nicaraguan government which is causing people to rebel, and not U.S. people.

MR. BELL: The vote is coming up in Congress. The Nicaraguans are saying, hey let's have a bi-partisan delegation come down here and look for themselves and see whether we are really what the Administration says we are. What's your reaction?

SECRETARY SHULTZ: Fine, I think that Congressmen travel all over the place, and I hope they go, and take a good hard look. And I might say that whenever people have gone down there and taken a hard look, of course they have to be careful that they don't get taken in by the propaganda. But a good, strong, hard look has changed peoples minds. I'll give you a couple of examples: The Kissinger Commission went down there and came back with a very strong view. A Congressional delegation all opposed to what the President did in Grenada went down there and they came back with a different view. So I say let them look.

(Interruption for commercials)

SECRETARY SHULTZ: May I interject a point. I'm sorry that you could not show that film, because I think it is important for us to keep reminding ourselves of this bit of history; and how important it is that we keep opportunities for education, for housing, for jobs and for political participation open to all comers in this country and set that standard up all around the world. We need to keep reminding ourselves about the importance of that.

MR. HARTMAN: Thank you. Now let's get back to Nicaragua. There's an ABC-Washington Post poll that says that seventy percent of Americans do not favor our government trying to "overthrow the government of Nicaragua". What do you say to those seventy percent who say that?

SECRETARY SHULTZ: Well I say let's try them out on a different question. Namely, do you think it is wise for our government to try to bring about a change in the behavior of the Nicaraguan government and to lend support to those in that country that are fighting for the freedom and independence of the country? I wonder what the percentages would fall out if asked the question that way.

MR. HARTMAN: Mr. Secretary, what's going to happen if right now the \$14 million dollars in aid, that is going to be voted in Congress to provide for the contras - the rebels fighting the Nicaraguan government? What happens if that money is not voted, is voted down?

SECRETARY SHULTZ: Well, we have a broad program in support of the objectives we seek in Central America that consists of many parts, and we need to keep pushing it and pushing it hard and all of its parts. We are supporting democracy, that is very important. I'm sure the American people support that idea. We are supporting the rule of law. We are supporting freedom of the press. We are supporting freedom of religion, things of that kind. We are supporting economic development, that is widely shared. And we believe that you are not going to attain those three things unless people can provide security for themselves in El Salvador and other countries of the region. And they are threatened by what's going on in Nicaragua. So you have to deal with the problem. Nicaragua and its behavior is the problem.

MR. BELL: If we could turn to another of the major subjects we've got the arms talks finally getting under way again between the U.S. and the Soviet Union. We pretty much have been toning down our rhetoric, they've toned down theirs -- until this last weekend when President Reagan seemed to be stepping back to his earlier rhetoric and talking about the export of tyranny by the Soviet Union. Is something changing?

SECRETARY SHULTZ: We are preparing ourselves carefully to go to those negotiations. And we hope and expect that they will get somewhere, and there is nothing changed about that at all.

MR. HARTMAN: But Mr. Secretary, just following up on what Steve just said, back at Geneva when we were over there and everything was toned down and quiet, as Steve suggested, but all of a sudden, as he suggested, we hear all this talk about "Star Wars," and the pressure we are not going to give up "Star Wars," we are not going to do this, we are not going to do that. How useful is that to you and all your colleagues and all our negotiators to walk into the talks, given all this rhetoric? How useful is it?

SECRETARY SHULTZ: Well, there is a lot of rhetoric the Soviets have been putting out. Rhetoric to the effect that nothing can happen unless we stop doing research on how we can defend ourselves better. But of course it is agreed by both sides that there is no way to verify any kind of commitment that somebody might make on research. And beyond that, research on how to defend ourselves is something we must do.

MR. HARTMAN: The Foreign Minister of Germany, Mr. Genscher, we understand is on his way, if he is not there right now, to the Soviet Union to talk to them. What is he talking to them about?

SECRETARY SHULTZ: I suppose he is -- I don't know exactly, but no doubt he is giving his view on the importance of these negotiations, and at the same time as all of our allies do, he is helping to make sure that the Soviets understand that there is real coherence and strength in our alliance.

MR. BELL: How concerned are you with Mr. Chernenko's continued obvious illness and inability to -- one would think -- conduct much of the responsibility he should have, that this in effect is going to prohibit the Soviets from taking the really tough kinds of steps towards compromise that are going to be necessary for any arms agreement?

SECRETARY SHULTZ: Well, I can only say that we are dealing with a functioning government in the Soviet Union. They are clearly capable of making important decisions such as to go to Geneva and make an agreement to restart the discussions of armaments. So, I wish Mr. Chernenko well, and I hope his health improves. But in the meantime, life goes on, and we are dealing with a functioning government and will continue to deal with the representatives that are put there.

MR. BELL: Thank you.

\*\*\*\*\*

# PRESS DEPARTMENT OF STATE



March 4, 1985  
No. 36

INTERVIEW OF  
THE HONORABLE KENNETH W. DAM  
ACTING SECRETARY OF STATE  
AND  
THE HONORABLE SENATOR CHRISTOPHER J. DODD  
MEMBER, FOREIGN RELATIONS COMMITTEE  
ON NBC-TV'S "MEET THE PRESS"  
Washington, DC  
March 3, 1985

**For further information contact:**

MR. KALB: Goodday from Washington. I am Marvin Kalb.

MR. MUDD: I'm Roger Mudd.

MR. KALB: And we welcome you to MEET THE PRESS.

It is, depending on your view, confrontational bordering on dangerous or courageous, a proper response to a communist challenge. We are talking, of course, about U.S. policy toward Nicaragua. At the moment, without doubt, the most vexing, controversial aspect of U.S. foreign policy. The immediate question is whether Congress has been persuaded by the administration's unflinching hard line to re-open funding for the contras, the anti-Sandinista rebels.

Our guests today on MEET THE PRESS are the Acting Secretary of State and a member of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, key players in this drama. Kenneth Dam is the Deputy Secretary of State, Acting Secretary while George Shultz is out of the country. He has pressed publicly and privately for more money for the contras. Christopher Dodd is the Democratic Senator from Connecticut. A sharp and persistent critic of Administration policy in Central America, he opposes more aid for the contras.

Roger, we hear what the Administration says, that there is no plan to send U.S. combat troops to Central America and yet it's often difficult to figure out whether the Administration might not be by its tough rhetoric somehow be preparing the American people for a military role in Central America.

MR. MUDD: I don't know about that, but I do suspect that the Administration's words in recent days do seem to have lost some of their old Sherman-like denials about possible military action.

Even the Republican Leader in the House, Bob Michel, of Illinois, said the other day, "I'm not altogether sure I do understand Administration strategy." But I must say, Marvin, that it's hard to remember so many powerful American leaders using so many powerful words in so short a time against a single government, the Sandinista regime in Nicaragua, and in favor of the regime's opposition, the contras.

President Reagan: (On tape) "I don't think the Sandinistas have a decent leg to stand on. What they have done is totalitarian. It is brutal, cruel and they have no argument against what -- what the rest of the people in Nicaragua want."

Secretary of State Shultz: (On tape.) "Those who would cut off these freedom fighters from the rest of the democratic world are, in effect, consigning Nicaragua to the endless darkness of communist tyranny."

Vice President Bush: (On tape) "Do we really want to allow the virus of international terrorism to affect the American mainland"?

President Reagan: (On tape) "They are the moral equal of our founding fathers and the brave men and women of the French Resistance. We cannot turn away from them."

MR. MUDD: Welcome to MEET THE PRESS, Mr. Secretary and Sen. Dodd. May I begin with you, Mr. Secretary? After all that escalating rhetoric, has it done any good?

MR. DAM: Well, I think that remains to be seen. This is a political issue. The administration has been very forthright in its policies. One question will be whether the aid will be voted by the



Congress. We shall see.

MR. MUDD: But what's the impact of the rhetoric been, according to your latest dispatches from the meeting that your Secretary of State, Mr. Shultz, had over the weekend with the President of Nicaragua?

MR. DAM: Well, I think that meeting was a meeting in which both sides stated essentially what they have stated publicly. I -- This was a meeting that the Sandinistas requested. And taking advantage of the fact that there was this inauguration in Uruguay. I don't think that one should look to a single meeting to see which way the wind is blowing, though I think it is interesting that these -- this meeting has occurred. There was another meeting here on Friday in Washington. And so, we are talking to the Nicaraguans about this.

MR. MUDD: And, Sen. Dodd, do you think that rhetoric we just heard is backfiring on Capitol Hill?

SEN. DODD: I don't know that it's backfiring or not. I don't think the Administration has the support either in the Senate or in the House to get the affirmative votes they will need now that the March -- February 28th date has expired. That is what they would need in order to release the \$14 million that is now available to be spent in support of the contras.

We've heard a lot of talk over a number of weeks and it just doesn't seem to be ringing true. As you pointed out, Bob Michels is concerned about what the strategy is. That's the Republican Leader of the House. And I can tell you just talking from -- to colleagues of mine, both Democrats and Republicans, there's no sense

of where we're headed here other than a request for 14 more million dollars on top of the \$100 or so million we've provided to the Contras over the last several years. What has it gotten us? Where is it taking us? How likely is it that the Central American situation can stabilize if we pursue this most recent request of the Administration?

MR. KALB: Mr. Secretary, could you tell us please, on the basis of your own unofficial nose-counting process up on the Hill, whether you feel that you have the votes.

MR. DAM: I think the Congress will support the Administration in this respect. There is a good deal of consultation going on about the form of support and the like, but I believe the support is there because I think there is a common view that there is a national security issue of great importance to the United States and general agreement on our goals in the area. Specifically, I think everyone recognizes that there has been a tremendous military buildup in Nicaragua. I think it's now generally agreed that it is true that the Nicaraguans have been supporting rebellion in and in nearby countries. I think there is a recognition that Nicaragua has been acting as a Soviet surrogate and I think there's a general desire to see Nicaragua move toward democracy.

Those are the four points that we've been emphasizing and I think there's general agreement on them.

MR. KALB: There is general agreement perhaps on the -- on the generalities of these four points, but would you say that there is general agreement between yourselves and countries we feel allied to in Central America, that the policy of direct confrontation with the

Sandinista regime is the proper policy for the United States to pursue?

MR. DAM: Well, without getting into our discussions with particular countries, I would say there is general agreement among those countries because they have the most at stake. Now they don't want to interfere with our internal processes in these countries, but I don't hear them saying that they're opposed to our approach; quite the contrary.

MR. KALB: Mr. Secretary, Sen. Dodd, we have a number of other questions obviously on Nicaragua and we shall return right after these messages.

[Announcements.]

MR. MUDD: We're back on MEET THE PRESS with Sen. Dodd and Secretary Dam. Mr. Secretary, a moment ago you said you thought there was the support on Capitol Hill for the Administration's request for the \$14 million in covert aid for the contras. Do you mean there's support up there for all 14 million or part of the 14 million, or part of it should be economic aid? Just what's the nature of the support? Because that statement you just gave runs counter to everything else I've heard up there, that for all intents and purposes that issue is dead.

MR. DAM: Well, I don't agree with that. But the 14 million is a Congressional number. Under the legislation, the Congress has a procedure for voting now after March 1 on this subject. The 14 million is general support. It's not designed to be economic or something else. It's -- It's support for the armed opposition.

MR. MUDD: Well, do you think you're going to get it all?

MR. DAM: Oh, I don't know. I don't think the question is whether it's 14 million or 10 million or 8 million. It's not the amount that is at issue, it is the principle that is at issue; and that's where the discussion is.

MR. MUDD: And it is -- Is it the administration's position that if you don't get that aid to the contras that, in fact, the Nicaraguan government of -- of -- slips into the dark depths of communist tyranny?

MR. DAM: What I think it means is the following. It means that the armed opposition is not in a position to be effective. It means that the unarmed opposition within Nicaragua loses hope and what that means is the Sandinistas are going to get their way sooner or later. Over time, they will be able to impose on Nicaragua their Marxist vision, which they've been quite candid in talking about.

MR. KALD: Let me ask you this. You oppose the aid to the contras. Would you just leave them high and dry, the people who are fighting, whether you agree that they're Somozistas or not?

SEN. DODD: Well, it isn't so much of leaving them high and dry. The question is whether or not the policy we're following is going to help us achieve the goals. And I would agree with the Secretary, I think the goals are basically the same. But it seems to me that -- rather than moving towards the achievement of those goals, the policy of supporting the contra operations is driving us exactly in the opposite direction.

MR. KALD: What would you specifically recommend that the

U.S. do in that case?

SEN. DODD: Well, for one thing we really ought to -- and I was pleased to see the Secretary of State say we want to get back to Contadora, the Contadora process. But frankly, I've heard that rhetoric in the past, never seen anything from it. The Kissinger Commission Report, as you may know, relegated a discussion of the Contadora process to a single paragraph on a 133 pages of recommendations for Central America. I'd like to see us do that, number one.

Number two, I'd like to see us really come in with some meaningful economic assistance to the Central American countries. Three, I'd like to see us do something with trade policies. Here we have the President announcing he's going to allow the Japanese to lift the voluntary restraints on automobiles. If we would just modify slightly some of the quotas we have on exports from some of these countries to our own nation and to others, I think we could do a tremendous amount economically there. There are some very positive things we can do. The first, however, is the Contadora process.

And I would disagree with Secretary Dam to this degree. Mexico, Venezuela, Panama and Columbia, four of our closest allies in the region do not agree that we are following a policy in this region that is beneficial either to ourselves or to them. They have urged us over many, many months for us to pursue a different course of action and we have neglected to follow their advice. It's an historic opportunity.

MR. KALB: Senator, do you believe -- Do you believe that the Sandinista regime is a Marxist-Leninist regime?

SEN. DODD: I think there are certain key elements of it that are. I would not --

MR. KALB: Do you think the leadership is?

SEN. DODD: Certain members of it are without any question and I don't -- I carry no brief for any of that. It seems to me how do we -- how do we pursue a policy that is going to -- to demilitarize the kind of situation that is getting out of hand in the region. Clearly --

MR. KALB: Okay. If it is true, sir -- If it is true that key elements of the Sandinista regime are Marxist-Leninist, could you cite any example around the world where when they are in power, through economic pressures or through diplomatic means they have willingly given up that pressure?

SEN. DODD: Sure. You can look to -- look to Somalia, look to Egypt, look to Guinea, look to other countries that have had key members of their governments who had clearly embraced that ideology and philosophy. I would note today that while China would clearly be considered a Marxist government, there's been an evolution there that today would bring, I think, the PRC more closely in line with our own geopolitical views than certainly the Soviet Union. We're seeing countries like Hungary and Czechoslovakia being more than just a slight thorn in the side of the Soviet Union.

MR. KALB: But they're still very much a part of the Soviet Bloc. We're not playing games on that.

SEN. DODD: Clearly. If we answer the question it's like a "have you stopped beating your wife" question. If we only look at it

in terms of military overthrows then the answer becomes somewhat different. If you're looking in terms of how are we facing down the Soviet Union today, I think the answer's a quite different one.

MR. KALE: Mr. Secretary, could you -- Could you tell us whether the Administration believes that it can co-exist, to pick up a loaded word -- can co-exist peacefully with a Sandinista regime in Central America?

MR. DAM: The Contadora countries themselves have agreed on certain principles and one of them is that there has to be a movement toward democratization. You recall the Sandinistas promised this as they came into power. We believe that's very important. We believe there are some other things that are important, too. But we believe that unless these Contadora objectives are fleshed out in full agreement through the Contadora process and then implemented, that it's going to be a very difficult situation.

MR. MUDD: Mr. Secretary, I'd like to ask you about the contras themselves, the opposition. They've been likened by your superiors in the government to Baron Von Steuben, to Lafayette, to freedom fighters, to Vladimir Koskiusko. They didn't mention Sgt. York, but I assume he's qualified to take his place along -- What are they like? I hear that they are ex-Somoza colonels, ex-Somoza National Guardsmen, they're terrorists, they engage in -- in acts of terror. This is not a bunch of sweethearts we're supporting, is it?

MR. DAM: Every -- Everyone of the principle leaders was an opponent of Somoza. They -- Many of them were in the original Sandinista government. They saw their ideals betrayed. They are now

trying to do something about it. I don't think that this campaign of slander against them is justified.

MR. MUDD: Well, do you have any assurance that a -- a government that is peopled by the contras will provide the people of Nicaragua any better government than they do now?

MR. DAM: I think there's a good reason to believe so and that is that they are very clear about their ideals and they're stating them very clearly. What they want, as Arturo Cruz said, is not a military solution, but a constitutional solution.

MR. KALD: Time for a break. We'll be back right after these messages.

-- MORE --



MR. KALB: We are back on MEET THE PRESS, with Secretary Dam and Senator Dodd.

Mr. Secretary, over the weekend, in fact, yesterday, the-- most of the rebel leadership got together in Costa Rica, and came up with what sounds like an ultimatum in at least one major respect, and that is that if the Sandinistas do not agree by April 20th of this year to get into serious discussions with them about the development of democracy, in Nicaragua, then they will, the rebels, go back fully, totally on the military side.

Does this Administration support that?

MR. DAM: Well, I don't know whether it's a question of whether we support it. They're speaking for themselves, but I think what is interesting is they are trying to have a dialogue with the Sandinistas, a dialogue that has been denied to them. They want a peaceful solution, and they're giving, they're telling the Sandinistas, "here is a chance."

MR. KALB: Well, here is a chance, but to accomplish what in such a brief period of time?

MR. DAM: Well, I think that that period of time, which is more than a month, is a good deal if there is a serious attempt on the Sandinistas to talk about how they can move toward democracy and a more pluralistic society.

MR. KALB: But, you know, Arturo Cruz is one of the leaders, used to be a Sandinista, isn't any more, is now political opposition, says in an article in The New Republic this weekend that basically the problem is among the Nicaraguans. It is really not between Nicaragua and the United States. And he's, in effect, politely asking the U.S.

to lay off for a while while they resolve their own problems.

Is that sensible?

MR. DAM: Well, there's something to it, yes. If the, if the Nicaraguans were to have an open society, in which the opposition could participate freely in the political process, campaign freely, that would be a different situation. That's why I was laying primary emphasis on the democratization aspect of the Contadora negotiation. Everyone in this country was very anxious for Duarte to meet with the armed opposition in El Salvador and he did so, and we all welcomed it. So it seems to me logically we ought to be for the same thing in Nicaragua.

MR. MUDD: Senator Dodd, the other day President Ortega of Nicaragua made the offer that he would send a hundred Cubans back each year. He also asked that the United States Congress send a delegation down to Nicaragua to see for itself the, quote, "defensive character of our country's armed forces." Would that be a good deal? Would you think the Congress ought to go down there and look it over?

SEN. DODD: I think certainly; any time members of Congress are invited on that kind of a mission it can be worth while. I don't know much more about it than what you've stated and what I read in the press. I would point out that I thought it was a mistake for the Administration to rule out of hand even before the Secretary of State sat down with Mr. Ortega that the meeting that occurred in Uruguay was going to be pointless and was worthless and not really worth much at all. And that the gesture to send 100 Cuban military advisors home, and to cut out new military systems was only tokenism. I'll admit that it's not a major overture, but it was, I think, significant. And I

wish that we would have, for once, instead of trying to characterize these things before they have occurred, give it a chance, to see if you can't pursue a line of discourse that will demilitarize, or at least lessen the threat of militarization.

Let me make one or two points, too, that I have to dispute the Secretary on. The leadership of the Contras, are former Somozan national guards. Not all the members. But in the front page of our newspapers across the country only last week was Enrique Bermudez, who was Somoza's attache here in Washington at the time he fell apart. And the entire command structure are Somozan National Guard people.

MR. KALB: The entire structure?

SEN. DODD: The command structure. If you look right down, all of them in that command structure were deeply involved in the National Guard of the Somoza regime. And while the Nicaraguan people I don't think enjoy any great love affair with the Sandinistas, the one thing they want more than anything else is not to go back to political-military leadership that comes out of that National Guard under Somoza. And to suggest, as the Administration has, that the leadership really does not include former Somozan National Guard people in significant numbers, I think, is a total mischaracterization, and we know better.

MR. MUDD: Senator, one more question: Is the unwillingness of the Congress to accept the Administration's argument in Nicaragua because the specter of Vietnam still hangs over the Capitol Building?

SEN. DODD: That's part of it. But also there is the strong

belief that we are not so bankrupt as a nation that the only tool we have remaining to us to deal with this problem is a military one. We think we have other options available to us. The Contadora process is one, an historic opportunity which has never presented itself before in this part of the world, where Latins, particularly the Mexicans and Venezuelans, have agreed to take the leadership position in trying to resolve this problem.

I, for one--and I know others feel as I do, that we should never eliminate the military option, at all. I would never tell the Sandinistas or anyone else for that matter that we would never exercise that option. But I cannot believe, sitting here in this day and age, that with all the power that we have available to us, and the allies we have in this hemisphere, that we have to pursue---financing of counter-guerrilla operation in Nicaragua is the only way in which we can deal with the Sandinistas. That's the mistake.

MR. KALB: Senator, in the little bit of time that is left, I would like to ask a couple of questions of the Secretary on the Middle East. This past week, with a great deal of activity taking place among Jordan, the PLO, Israel, Egypt, the State Department said it is ready to re-engage. What does that word mean? Are we getting back into the negotiating business as a middle man?

MR. DAM: We don't believe that the time is right for a major U.S. initiative, say, with a high level emissary, and that sort of thing. What we do believe is that the activity is good, and positive. But it's not clear yet that the parties are willing to engage in direct negotiations. We will re-engage and help in that process,

but we believe there has to be less ambiguity, less uncertainty than at present.

MR. KALB: What do you think is now happening? What are all of these parties in the Middle East saying?

MR. DAM: I think they're saying that they realize that peace is important, that they have a responsibility for getting there, to getting to negotiations of some kind, and it's not just a U.S. responsibility.

MR. KALB: Gentlemen, that's it. Thank you both very much for being with us, Secretary of State Kenneth Dam, Senator Dodd.

Roger and I will be back after these messages.

(Announcements.)

MR. KALB: Roger, you know, after listening to Secretary Dam and Senator Dodd, really two contrasting points of view on the best policy options for the United States, it is still not clear what the ultimate objective of the United States is. It is not clear whether we really want to topple the Sandinista regime, whether we think the leopard will change its spots, being Marxist-Leninist, whether the Administration feels through economic or diplomatic pressures that it will change. There really is not a track record of success for a communist government if it be that changing its very nature, which is, I think, what the President is saying when he says he wants them to cry uncle.

MR. MUDD: Well, I thought the, I thought he laid it out pretty clearly the other night in his press conference what the policy was, and his policy was to change that government. Whether you say over-throw or make them squeal until they say uncle, it seems to me

he wants to get rid of that government. I'm not sure I know what quite the verb is. But what's happening again, it seems to me, is that once more a President of the United States is laying on the line his prestige, his power, and his vanity on behalf of a group of dissidents, Contras; the more emphasis he gives to them, the more he calls them freedom fighters, the higher the stakes get.

General Gorman, who is retiring as the military commander down there, says, "those guys can't overthrow the government in Managua, not in the foreseeable future." So what happens is if the Contras don't make it, and the chances are they won't make it, the President of the United States takes a defeat. No President wants a defeat. So we get instead of \$14 million, they ask for \$24 million. Then it's \$54 million and then before you know it we may get some talk about military advisors.

MR. KALB: Well, you may get the military advisors, but the interesting thing is, it seems to me, that the Pentagon, much more than the State Department, seems cautious about any kind of commitment of U.S. ground forces into Central America.

That's it for now. Thank you all for joining us. I am Marvin Kalb, with Roger Mudd, saying good-bye for MEET THE PRESS and we hope to see you next Sunday.

- - -

# PRESS DEPARTMENT OF STATE



March 4, 1985  
NO. 37

STATEMENT BY  
THE HONORABLE GEORGE P. SHULTZ  
SECRETARY OF STATE  
THE VICTORIA PLAZA HOTEL  
MONTEVIDEO, URUGUAY  
MARCH 2, 1985

SECRETARY SHULTZ: (Mr. Ortega) reiterated the points that he has stated publicly before, and I stated again the objectives that the United States and our friends in the region of Central America have consistently advocated for several years. Namely: first of all the importance of Nicaragua reducing its military abilities and forces to levels that are consistent with what is needed for defensive purposes in Central America. Second of all, the removal from Nicaragua of the evidences of the introduction of the Soviet-Cuban presence, and the introduction of the Soviet-Cuban presence, and the introduction of the East-West conflict into Central America. Third, an end to the use of Nicaragua as a base from which to bring about undoubted efforts to subvert its neighbors. And fourth, to bring about in Nicaragua progress towards democracy as has been promised on innumerable occasions including in the original presentation of the Sandinistas to the OAS. These objectives are totally consistent with the 21 principles which were agreed upon by the Contadora Group. The release, or the expected announced release, of the political prisoner Urbina Lara is long overdue. We can hope that it will lead to a resumption of the Contadora process. The Contadora process is the right forum for the discussion of the issues as the people in the region see them, and clearly there are problems, as the people in the region see them, with the current latest draft of the ACTA, and we trust that there will be a meeting and these issues will be resolved. Thank you.

\*\*\*\*\*

**For further information contact:**

# PRESS DEPARTMENT OF STATE



March 5, 1985  
No. 38

PC# 31

PRESS CONFERENCE  
BY  
THE HONORABLE GEORGE P. SHULTZ  
SECRETARY OF STATE  
Montevideo, Uruguay  
March 2, 1985

SECRETARY SHULTZ: I congratulate President Sanguinetti and the other democratic leaders of Uruguay for leading their country back to a democratic form of government and for making the most impressive set of ceremonies yesterday that marked that return. Uruguay's return to democracy was not easy. But the Uruguayan people showed that negotiated political transitions are not only desirable, but achievable. Uruguay has set an example of how pro-transition forces in all sectors can reach a consensus on democracy, a system that guarantees its citizens personal and civil liberties.

We in the United States feel united to Uruguay by the democratic ideals and values that both our peoples cherish. I might say that it is notable that at the inauguration ceremonies there were 25 countries represented at a chief of state or foreign ministry level -- 25 democratic countries, 5 chiefs of state. So it isn't only the United States but others recognize the emergence of true democracy when they see it. We look forward to working closely with your new Government and Congress as we seek to develop with you a framework and understanding of each others' concerns and needs. We have already begun this process of working together through the meetings I have been able to have with President Sanguinetti, with Finance Minister Zerbino, and Foreign Minister Iglesias. And in those meetings, we reviewed a number of economic and political issues of mutual concern. In addition, I met with many of your political



- 2 -

party leaders, with whom we hope to continue the dialogue we undertook during this transition. We must continue to work together to strengthen freedom and democracy in our Hemisphere. Questions?

QUESTION: You spoke about strengthening democracy in the Hemisphere, and in that regard, what is your present position vis-a-vis Chile?

SECRETARY SHULTZ: Chile should return to democracy. We are very clear in our view about that and we'd like to see that happen.

QUESTION: Nicaragua has denounced a plan of aggression by the Reagan Government. You, Secretary of State George Shultz, can you deny this publicly?

SECRETARY SHULTZ: We have no aggressive intent towards the people of Nicaragua. The problem with Nicaragua is that their Government is conducting itself in such a manner that it is bringing an adverse reaction from their own people. And so there's a lot of resistance in Nicaragua. Furthermore, the pattern in Nicaragua of over-armament and subversion of its neighbors is disruptive to the entire Central American region and it's deplorable. It's deplorable to have the economic infrastructure attacked and to see the work of guerrillas, particularly in El Salvador, supported by Nicaragua. So we wish to see this come to an end and we believe that the right kind of Contadora agreement might very well bring that about. So we have supported the Contadora process from the beginning.

QUESTION: The Government of Nicaragua has announced its willingness to suspend the purchase of additional armaments and arrange for the departure of 100 Cubans from its country. The U.S. Government has considered these steps to be insufficient, but I ask, don't you believe that this is a good beginning and on the road towards better relationship between the two countries -- reduction of armaments?

SECRETARY SHULTZ: Well, your question suggests why it is that the statements of Nicaragua raised more questions than they answer. For example, I think I'm quoting you right in saying that they proposed a -- what did you say on armaments?

QUESTION: Reduction of armaments.

SECRETARY SHULTZ: That is not what they propose, if you look at it very carefully. What they proposed is not to -- to have a moratorium on the importation of new systems of armaments. It's very tricky, though. It raises a lot of questions.

On the question of the Cubans, how many Cubans are there of military sorts? We compute that if they have a hundred Cubans leave by the end of 1985, which was what they said, it would take until the middle of the next century for all the Cubans to have left at that rate. But the question is, how many Cubans are there there and at what rate do they intend to have them really leave?

The statement doesn't address the question of subversion in other governments and of their neighbors, and so on. So, as far as the release of Mr. Urbina Lara, that's in the category, we're glad to see that release. And perhaps it will help the Contadora process get going again. But it has to fall in the category of doing something very bad and then saying you're gonna stop doing it and everybody cheers. I mean, so that's a gesture but it's a peculiar kind of gesture. But I would like to emphasize that we support the Contadora process. We hope that the discussion resumes. We hope that it will develop a worthwhile and constructive outcome. In order for that to happen, the process must address the concerns of the Central American countries that are threatened by Nicaraguan armaments and subversion.

QUESTION: Has there been any change as a result of the meeting with President Ortega?

SECRETARY SHULTZ: I don't know that anything much has changed, although perhaps there is a recognition all around that the center of negotiation must be the Contadora process and the sooner everyone gets back to that process, the better.

QUESTION: The question is, Mr. Shultz, why is the United States Government continuing to exert pressure on the Nicaraguan Government, which is a result of the free elections that were held in that country? Why don't you pressure other dictatorships such as Chile and Paraguay? In the latter country, the dictatorship has been in power for over thirty years.

SECRETARY SHULTZ: We have made our views about countries governed in an authoritarian way made known consistently, and I think it is of great note in our Hemisphere and in Latin America that as recently as 1979, only a third of the people lived under conditions of democracy, and by the end of this month, that fraction will be 90%. Unfortunately, one cannot put the people of Nicaragua in that category since the election there can hardly be characterized as an open, democratic election. It is interesting to contrast the turn-out of democratic countries to celebrate the return of

- 4 -

Uruguay to democracy: twenty-five democratic governments represented at the chief of state and foreign ministry level. If you leave aside the Soviet bloc and contrast that with Nicaragua, there were no chiefs of state present and there were only five foreign ministers -- four of whom were more or less obligatory attendance by the foreign ministers of Central America.

We have got time just for two more questions.

QUESTION: What role do you believe that Europe can play in the peace process of Central America, and what role do you think that President Gonzalez is playing in that? You think that role is too big or too little?

SECRETARY SHULTZ: I think that European countries -- the European Commission, representatives or Community representatives -- met in San Jose last summer. I think their support for democracy, for the rule of law, for economic development, can play a constructive role, and certainly Prime Minister Felipe Gonzalez, as a person, in the country that recently went from authoritarian rule to democratic rule and with Spain as a base, can be a very constructive element in the picture, and I believe that that is his wish and we welcome it.

QUESTION: Mr. Secretary, did you indicate to President Ortega a willingness to resume the meetings in Mexico or any place else? Did President Ortega make any new concessions during the meeting?

SECRETARY SHULTZ: Discussions in the Contadora group are the kind of discussions necessary to resolve the problems. And the parties to the Contadora discussions have the capacity within themselves to solve those problems. So we believe that any next step should be in that process. The Manzanillo talks were undertaken in order to support, if they could, the Contadora process. We have no reluctance about having additional talks of that kind, but only insofar as they support Contadora, not as an alternative to Contadora, and we made that clear.

Let me just make one final comment. We came here to celebrate the return of democracy in Uruguay and the sweep of democracy throughout Latin America. It is perhaps understandable but ironic that questions in a setting such as this are dominated by the problems created by an undemocratic country in the region, but let me just underline the importance of democracy as shown by the return of democracy to Uruguay. In that connection, I'm pleased to say that I was authorized

- 5 -

yesterday to extend on behalf of President Reagan to President Sanguinetti an invitation to visit Washington for a state visit sometime in the latter half of the year, time to be worked out between the parties, and while he couldn't very well respond yesterday before he was officially the President, he has let us know today that he accepts the invitation and so we will be looking forward to visiting with him when he comes to Washington. Thank you all very much.

\*\*\*\*\*

# PRESS DEPARTMENT OF STATE

March 5, 1985  
NO. 39



## WORLD CONFERENCE TO REVIEW AND APPRAISE THE ACHIEVEMENTS OF THE UNITED NATIONS DECADE FOR WOMEN

The State Department today announced the members of the U.S. delegation to the World Conference to Review and Appraise the Achievements of the United Nations Decade for Women which will be held in Nairobi, Kenya, July 15-26, 1985.

### U.S. Representative

MAUREEN REAGAN - Businessowner, Lecturer, Broadcaster.

### Alternate Representative

NANCY CLARK REYNOLDS - U.S. Representative to the UN Commission on the Status of Women.

### Members

LENORA COLE ALEXANDER - Director, Women's Bureau, Department of Labor. Delegate to U.N. Women's Conference, Vienna, 1982-83.

VIRGINIA ALLAN - Project Director - National Consultative Committee: Planning for Nairobi NGO Conference for Overseas Education Fund/League of Women Voters.

DONNA ALVARADO - Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense for Equal Opportunity and Safety Policy. Nominee for Director of ACTION.

MITZI AYALA - Vice President, American Agri-Women.

LINDY BOGGS - Member of Congress since 1973 from Louisiana. Member, Select Committee on Children, Youth and Family.

LINDA CHAVEZ - Staff Director, U.S. Commission on Civil Rights.

ESTHER COOPERSMITH - Former Delegate to the U.N.; Delegate to U.N. Women's Conference, Vienna, 1984-85.

HOLLY COORS - Homemaker, Philanthropist, Businessowner.

MAUREEN CORCORAN - General Counsel, Department of Education.

PATRICIA DIAZ DENNIS - Member, National Labor Relations Board.

BETTY DILLON - Director, U.S. Secretariat for the World Conference of the U.N. Decade for Women, Department of State.

RHODA DORSEY - President, Goucher College.

CARRIE FRANCKE - Assistant Attorney General, Missouri.

MARY GREFE - President, American Association of University Women (1977-81). Delegate to U.N. Mid-Decade Conference, Copenhagen, 1980.

PATRICIA GOLDMAN - Vice Chair, National Transportation Safety Board.

MARGARET HECKLER - Secretary, U.S. Department of Health and Human Services.

LOIS HERRINGTON - Assistant Attorney General, U.S. Department of Justice.

MARJORIE HOLT - Member of Congress since 1972 from Maryland.

DONNA IKEDA - State Representative, Hawaii.

NANCY LANDON KASSEBAUM - U.S. Senator, Kansas.

ALAN KEYES - U.S. Representative on U.N. Economic and Social Council.

JEANE KIRKPATRICK - U.S. Ambassador to United Nations.

BARBARA MAHONE - Director, Human Resource Management, General Motors Corporation.

BERYL MILBURN - Member, Board of Regents, University of Texas, Delegate to U.N. Women's Conference, Vienna, 1984.

RUTH MILLER - President, Tower City Center, Cleveland, Ohio.

NANCY RISQUE - Deputy Assistant to the President for Legislative Affairs.

EVONE SIDNEY - Representative, Hopi Federation, Arizona.

ANN STANFORD - Director, International Women's Programs - Bureau of International Organizational Affairs, Department of State.

ARLISS STURGELEWSKI - State Senator, Alaska.

ALICE ROXANA THOMPSON - Director, Information Center, International Brotherhood of Teamsters.

SARAH TINSLEY - Deputy Administrator for External Affairs - AID

MARGARET TUTWILER - Assistant Secretary of Treasury (Public Affairs and Public Liaison) - designate.

ARLENE VIOLET - Attorney General, Rhode Island.

JERI WINGER - International President, General Federation of Women's Clubs.

The United Nations proclaimed 1975 as International Women's Year (IWY) out of a growing recognition that the full and equal participation of women was essential to world development and peace. A UN Conference held in Mexico City in 1975 adopted a resolution declaring 1976-1985 as the UN Decade for Women. The Nairobi Conference is the culminating international event of the United Nations Decade for Women which will build on the experience of the Decade and adopt comprehensive and forward-looking strategies to insure that women, in their multiple roles, can take their place in society on an equal basis with men.

Early appointment of the U.S. delegation insures maximum involvement of this broad-based group of delegates representing all regions of the U.S., industry, labor, government, NGOs and academia in preparation for the Conference. Several members of the delegation have participated in previous international conferences and have experience in the UN system.

For further information contact: Barbara Good 632-2713  
Peggy Stark 632-8603

# PRESS

## DEPARTMENT OF STATE



March 6, 1985  
NO. 40

### THE DRUG PROBLEM: AMERICANS ARRESTED ABROAD

The Department of State's Citizen's Emergency Center in the Bureau of Consular Affairs reports that 2,745 Americans were arrested abroad during 1984. Thirty-two percent of the arrests were for using, possessing or trafficking in illegal drugs. Americans were arrested on drug-related charges in 63 countries. Mexico, Jamaica, the Bahamas, the Federal Republic of Germany and the Dominican Republic accounted for 60 percent of the total number of arrests. The majority of these arrests involved marijuana, with 57 percent of the marijuana charges based on possession of one ounce or less.

#### Advice for Travelers

Although drug laws vary by country, there are serious consequences for drug involvement in many parts of the world. Foreign anti-narcotics laws often are even more strict than those of the United States. There is a trend toward intensified prosecution of drug cases abroad and Americans have been jailed for possession of as little as three grams of marijuana. Some countries do not allow bail for drug offenses and few provide jury trials. Pretrial detention can continue for months and even years before trial and sentencing. Penalties can include heavy fines and sentences from two to 25 years, with some countries imposing life sentences or the death penalty. Legal expenses and subsistence costs while incarcerated -- sometimes in very primitive conditions -- can be extremely high.

#### U.S. Consular Responsibilities for Arrested Americans

Outside of the United States, Americans are not protected by U.S. laws. To the extent possible, U.S. consular officers can ensure that a U.S. citizen's rights under local law and international standards of humane treatment are observed. A consular officer will visit the detainee as soon as possible after notification of arrest, will visit regularly thereafter, and can alert family and friends. Consular officers can arrange for transmittal of financial or other aid from interested parties in the U.S. to the detainee. They cannot give legal counsel, provide legal representation or pay legal or other fees with U.S. government funds. Nor can consular officers intervene in the foreign judicial system to attempt to obtain special treatment.

**For further information contact:**



Citizens Emergency Center

In the United States, the Citizens Emergency Center provides emergency services relating to the protection of Americans arrested abroad. This includes transfer of private funds from relatives in the U.S. to Foreign Service posts for delivery to the detained person. Assistance is available Monday through Friday from 8:15 a.m. to 10:00 p.m. (EST) at (202)632-5225. After hours and on weekends and holidays, a duty officer is available for emergencies at (202) 634-3600.

For further information contact: James Callahan 632-1488

# PRESS DEPARTMENT OF STATE

March 6, 1985  
NO. 41

AS PREPARED FOR DELIVERY



ADDRESS BY  
THE HONORABLE GEORGE P. SHULTZ  
SECRETARY OF STATE  
TO THE  
NATIONAL ACADEMY OF SCIENCES  
WASHINGTON, D.C.  
MARCH 6, 1985

Soon after the dawn of the nuclear age, Albert Einstein observed that everything had changed except our modes of thinking. Even so dramatic a development as the nuclear revolution took a long time to be fully understood. In recent decades, the world has seen other extraordinary advances in science and technology -- advances that may be of even more pervasive importance and that touch every aspect of our lives. In so many of these areas, the pace of change has been faster than our ability to grasp its ramifications. There have even been moments when our mood was more one of fear than of hope.

In the 1970s, many were preoccupied with the idea that ours was a small planet and getting smaller, that natural resources were limited and were being depleted, that there were inescapable limits to growth. Food would run out; forests would disappear; clean water would be scarce; energy sources would vanish. There was, in short, a deep pessimism about the future of our planet and of mankind itself.

Fortunately, that spirit of pessimism has been replaced in recent years by a new spirit of progress. More and more, we are returning to the belief traditionally held by post-Enlightenment societies: that the advance of science is something to be welcomed and encouraged, because it multiplies our possibilities faster than it adds to our problems.

- 2 -

More and more, we see that unleashing the vast potential of human ingenuity, creativity, and industriousness is itself the key to a better future. Science and technology cannot solve all our problems, but the experience of recent years reminds us that they can alleviate wide areas of human suffering and make a better life possible for millions around the world. We can only imagine what they might achieve in the decades to come.

When I was at MIT, I knew an economist at Harvard who had an uncanny knack for making accurate predictions. I always wondered about the secret of his forecasting ability, and when he died, someone going through his papers found part of the explanation. He had written that he was more successful at economic predictions than others because he was "an optimist about America," a trait he attributed to two things: his origins in the Midwest, "where the future is more important than the past," and the fact that he grew up in a family of scientists and engineers, forever "discovering" and "doing" new things.

Optimism alone will not be enough to carry us through the difficult times that lie ahead, and mindless optimism would be as foolish as the mindless pessimism of years past.

The scientific and technological revolutions taking place all around us offer many great opportunities, but they also present many challenges -- challenges that come from the need to make choices, challenges that lie at the intersection of science and politics, and perhaps most important, challenges to our ways of thinking about ourselves and our world.

### Dilemmas and Choices

The revolutions in science and technology have opened up seemingly limitless possibilities for transforming our world. With each new breakthrough, however, come new and difficult dilemmas. For while we may seek ways to change the world around us, there is also much we would like to preserve. Our civilization is not based on material things. Our culture, our moral values, and our political ideals are treasures that we would not sacrifice even for the most amazing scientific miracle.

Breakthroughs in biological engineering, for instance, raise fundamental moral questions about man's proper role in the creation and alteration of life, even as they offer new hope to cure diseases, produce food, and broaden our understanding of the origins of life.

We need to be concerned about the dangers to our environment that may accompany some new technologies, even while recognizing that other new technologies may be the source of solutions to these problems. We need to ensure that the revolution in communications does not infringe on our right to privacy, even while recognizing the enormous benefits of improved communication for education and for bringing the world closer together. This is the human condition: the creativity that is one part of our nature poses constant challenges to the morality that is another part of our nature. There is no final resting place, no permanent solution -- only a continuing responsibility to face up to these hard dilemmas.

We also face some difficult practical choices, and as societies we address them through our political process. Scientific research and development, for example, require financial support. Where should that support come from? And what should be supported? The United States will invest some \$110 billion in scientific research and development next year -- more than Japan, France, West Germany, and the United Kingdom combined. Of that amount, nearly half comes from the federal government. That is a large investment, taken by democratic process from the American taxpayer. But it reflects a choice we have all made to support scientific progress.

- 5 -

It reflects our understanding that scientific advance serves everyone in our society -- by improving health and the quality of life, by expanding our economy, by enhancing the competitiveness of our industries in the world market, by improving our defenses, and perhaps most important, simply by pushing back the frontiers of knowledge.

Yet we have also learned that government can become too involved, that government bureaucracies are not always the best judges of where such money can most usefully be spent. Today, private industry, not government, is pushing hardest at the technological frontiers in many fields -- in electronics and biotechnology, to name just two.

The problem, then, is to discover how government support for science and technology can best serve the broad goals of society. In the field of basic research, for example, we cannot always count on the profit motive to foster progress in those areas where research may not lead to the development of marketable products for many years. Government support for basic research gives learning and the pursuit of knowledge a chance to proceed without undergoing the rigorous test of the market place.

- 6 -

One particularly worthy recipient of government support, therefore, is the university. The unfettered process of learning and discovery that takes place mainly in academia is vital. From the university comes the fundamental knowledge that ultimately drives innovation. And from the university comes the pool of creative and technically proficient young men and women who can use that knowledge and apply it to practical problems. The Reagan Administration recognizes the importance of this; since 1981, support for basic research at universities has grown by nearly 30 percent.

Even so, the government has limited funds, and further choices have to be made about which projects to support and which to cut back. Government, universities, and the private sector have to work together to make these difficult but inescapable decisions. We as a society cannot afford to turn away from the challenge of choosing.

#### Science and Politics

These are not the only hard choices that have to be confronted at the intersection of science and politics. Scientific advances have increasingly become the focus of political debate. Today, scientific questions, and scientists themselves, play a prominent role in the political arena.



On a wide variety of complex issues the American people look to scientists as an important source of information and guidance. In a nation like ours, where knowledge is valued and the search for truth is considered among the noblest of human endeavors, the scientist naturally and properly commands great respect. With that respect, however, comes responsibility.

Too often in recent years we have seen scientists with well-deserved reputations for creative achievement and intellectual brilliance speaking out on behalf of political ideas that unfortunately are neither responsible nor particularly brilliant.

It is not surprising that scientists will have strong views on such technically complex matters as nuclear weapons, arms control, and national defense. But the core issues in dispute here are really not technical, but political and moral. Scientists should not expect their words to have special authority in non-scientific areas where they are, in fact, laymen. Scientists are not specialists in the field of world politics, or history, or social policy, or military doctrine. As citizens of a free society, they have every right to take part in the public debate. But they have no special claim to infallibility.

Challenges to Our Ways of Thinking

The great intellectual adventure of the scientific revolution beckons all of us -- scientists, government leaders, and all Americans -- to march ahead together. In collaboration we can achieve a better and deeper understanding of these new developments and what they portend. The changes occurring all around us have far-reaching implications not only for our personal lives, but also for the conduct of our foreign policy, for national security, and indeed for the very structure of the international order. And as we confront these changes, we must heed Einstein's observation: Perhaps the greatest challenges we face are to our ways of thinking.

The Age of Information Technology. -- One of the most revolutionary recent developments is what Walter Wriston has called "the onrushing age of information technology." The combination of microchip computers, advanced telecommunications -- and a continuing process of innovation -- is not only transforming communication and other aspects of daily life, but is also challenging the very concepts of national sovereignty and the role of government in society.

The implications of this revolution are not only economic. First of all, the very existence of these new technologies is yet another testimony to the crucial importance of entrepreneurship -- and government policies that give free rein to entrepreneurship -- as the wellspring of technological creativity and economic growth. The closed societies of the East are likely to fall far behind in these areas -- and Western societies that maintain too many restrictions on economic activity run the same risk.

Second, any government that resorts to heavy-handed measures to control or regulate or tax the flow of electronic information will find itself stifling the growth of the world economy as well as its own progress. This is one of the reasons why the United States is pressing for a new round of trade negotiations in these service fields, to break down barriers to the free flow of knowledge across borders.

For two years the Organization of Economic Cooperation and Development has been considering an American initiative for a common approach to this problem. Today we are very close to obtaining a joint statement by OECD governments pledging themselves to:

- maintain and promote unhindered circulation of data and information,
- avoid creating barriers to information flows, and
- cooperate and consult to further these goals.

Even here there are dilemmas, however. Government efforts to prevent the copywriting of computer software only reduce incentives for developing new types of software and inhibit progress. We need to understand clearly the crucial difference between promoting the flow of information and blocking innovation. The entire free world has a stake in building a more open system, because together we can progress faster and farther than any of us can alone.

This points to another advantage the West enjoys. The free flow of information is inherently compatible with our political system and values. The Communist states, in contrast, fear this information explosion perhaps even more than they fear Western military strength. If knowledge is power, then the communications revolution threatens to undermine their most important monopoly -- their effort to stifle their people's information, thought, and independence of judgment. We all remember the power of the Ayatollah's message disseminated on tape cassettes in Iran; what could have a more profound impact in the Soviet bloc than similar cassettes, outside radio broadcasting, direct broadcast satellites, personal computers, or xerox machines?

Totalitarian societies face a dilemma: Either they try to stifle these technologies and thereby fall further behind in the new industrial revolution, or else they permit these technologies and see their totalitarian control inevitably eroded. In fact, they do not have a choice, because they will never be able entirely to block the tide of technological advance.

The revolution in global communication thus forces all nations to reconsider traditional ways of thinking about national sovereignty. We are reminded anew of the world's interdependence, and we are reminded as well that only a world of spreading freedom is compatible with human and technological progress.

The Evolution of Strategic Defense. -- Another striking example of the impact of scientific and technological change is the issue of strategic defense. Here the great challenge to us is not simply to achieve scientific and engineering breakthroughs. As real a difficulty is to come to grips with "our ways of thinking" about strategic matters in the face of technical change.

For decades, standard strategic doctrine in the West has ultimately relied on the balance of terror -- the confrontation of offensive arsenals by which the two sides threaten each other with mass extermination. Deterrence has worked under these conditions and we should not abandon what works until we know that something better is genuinely available. Nevertheless, for political, strategic, and even moral reasons, we owe it to ourselves and to future generations to explore the new possibilities that offer hope for strategic defense, that could minimize the dangers and destructiveness of nuclear war. If such technologies can be discovered, and the promise is certainly there, then we will be in a position to do better than the conventional wisdom which holds that our defense strategy must rely on solely offensive threats and must leave our people and our military capability unprotected against attack.

Adapting our ways of thinking is never an easy process. The vehemence of some of the criticism of the President's Strategic Defense Initiative seems to come less from the debate over technical feasibility -- which future research will settle one way or another in an objective manner -- than from the passionate defense of orthodox doctrine in the face of changing strategic realities.

We are proceeding with SDI research because we see a positive, and indeed revolutionary potential: Defensive measures may become available that could render obsolete the threat of an offensive first strike. A new strategic equilibrium based on defensive technologies and sharply reduced offensive deployments is likely to be the most stable and secure arrangement of all.

### Science and Foreign Policy

These are but two examples of how technological advances affect our foreign policy. There are many others. It is in our national interest, for example, to help other countries achieve the kinds of technological progress that hold such promise for improving the quality of life for all the world's people. The expansion of the global economy, and new possibilities of international cooperation, are among the benefits that lie ahead of us as technical skills grow around the world.

Therefore, cooperation in the fields of science and technology plays an increasing role in our relations with a range of countries. We have important cooperative links with China and India, for example, as well as with many other nations in the developing world.

- 14 -

We are working with nations in Asia, Latin America, and Africa to achieve breakthroughs in dryland agriculture and livestock production to help ease food shortages, or in medicine and public health to combat the scourge of disease. Our scientific relations with the industrialized nations of Western Europe and Japan aim at breaking down barriers to the transfer of technological knowhow.

Clearly, our science and technology relationships with other industrialized nations are not without problems. There is, in fact, a permanent tension between our desire to share technological advances and our equally strong desire to see American products compete effectively in the international market. We cannot resolve this dilemma, nor should we. The interplay between the advancement of knowledge and competition is productive. Some nations may focus their efforts too heavily on competition at the expense of the spread of knowledge that can benefit everyone, and certainly we in the United States should not be alone in supporting basic scientific research. The industrialized nations should work together to strike a balance that can promote the essential sharing of scientific advances and at the same time stimulate the competitive spirit which itself makes such an important contribution to technological progress.



Technology Transfer

A further dilemma arises where new technologies may have military applications. We maintain a science and technology relationship with the Soviet Union, for instance, even though we must work to ensure that the technologies we share with the Soviets cannot be used to threaten Western security.

The innovations of high technology are obviously a boon to all nations that put them to productive use for the benefit of their peoples. But in some societies, it often seems that the people are the last to get these benefits. The Soviet Union has for decades sought to gain access, through one means or another, to the technological miracles taking place throughout the free world. And one of their goals has been to use these new technologies to advance their political aims -- to build better weapons, not better health care; better means of surveillance, not better telephone systems.

This, of course, poses another dilemma. We seek an open world, where technological advances and knowhow can cross borders freely. We welcome cooperation with the Soviet Union in science and technology.

- 16 -

And yet in the world as it exists today, the West has no choice but to take precautions with technologies that have military applications. Cooperation with our allies is essential. Countries that receive sensitive technologies from the United States must maintain the proper controls to prevent them from falling into the hands of our adversaries.

Scientists can help us think through this difficult problem. What technologies can be safely transferred? How do we safeguard against the transfer of technologies that have dual uses? Where do we strike the balance?

#### The Proliferation of Nuclear and Chemical Weapons

And scientists can also be helpful in other areas where the free flow of technical knowledge poses dangers. One priority goal of our foreign policy, for instance, is to strengthen international controls over two of the grimmer products of modern technology: weapons of mass destruction, both nuclear and chemical.

The world community's success or failure in preventing the spread of nuclear weapons will have a direct impact on the prospects for arms control and disarmament, on the development of nuclear energy for peaceful purposes, and indeed on the prospects for peace on this planet. The United States pursues the goal of non-proliferation through many avenues:

- 17 -

- We have long been the leader of an international effort to establish a regime of institutional arrangements, legal commitments, and technological safeguards against the spread of nuclear weapons capabilities. We take an active part in such multilateral agencies as the International Atomic Energy Agency, the Nuclear Energy Agency, and International Energy Agency.
  
- Although we have major differences with the Soviet Union on many arms control issues, we have a broad common interest in nuclear non-proliferation. In the fall of 1982, Foreign Minister Gromyko and I agreed to initiate bilateral consultations on this problem; since then, several rounds of useful discussions have taken place, with both sides finding more areas of agreement than of disagreement.
  
- This year, the United States will sit down with the 126 other parties to the Non-Proliferation Treaty for the third time in a major review conference. We will stress the overarching significance of the Treaty, its contribution to world peace and security, and the reasons why it is in every nation's fundamental interest to work for universal adherence to it.

The progress in nuclear non-proliferation has unfortunately not been matched in the area of chemical weapons. The sad fact is that a half century of widely accepted international restraint on the use or development of chemical weapons is in danger of breaking down. In 1963, we estimated that only five countries possessed these weapons. Now, we estimate that at least thirteen countries have them, and more are trying to get them. As we have seen, the problem has become particularly acute in the war in the Persian Gulf.

We have had some marked success in limiting the spread of nuclear weapons in part because the world community has worked together to raise awareness and to devise concrete measures for dealing with the problem. We must do the same in the field of chemical weapons. It will not be an easy task. Chemical industries and dual-use chemicals are more numerous than their counterparts in the nuclear field, and chemical weapons involve lower levels of technology and cost less than nuclear weapons. But the effort must be made:

- First, we need to raise international awareness that there is a growing problem and that developed nations, in particular, have a special obligation to help control the spread of chemical weapons.

- Second, we need to expand and improve our intelligence capabilities and provide for greater coordination between intelligence services and policymakers in all countries.
  
- And third, we must take both bilateral and multilateral actions to deal with problem countries and to curb exports of materials that can be used in the manufacture of chemical weapons.

The scientific community can help in a variety of ways. Chemical engineers can help us identify those items that are essential to the manufacture of chemical weapons and then determine which countries possess them, so that we can promote more effective international cooperation. Scientists can help us find better ways to check the flow of the most critical items without overly inhibiting the transfer of information and products that serve so many beneficial purposes around the world.

These are difficult problems, but if we work together we can begin to find better answers.

The Vision of a Hopeful Future

I want to end, as I began, on a note of hope. If we confront these tough issues with wisdom and responsibility, the future holds great promise. President Reagan, in his State of the Union message last month, reminded us all of the important lesson we should have learned by now: "There are no constraints on the human mind, no walls around the human spirit, no barriers to our progress except those we ourselves erect." Today we see this fundamental truth being borne out again in China, where a bold new experiment in openness and individual incentives is beginning to liberate the energies of a billion talented people. The Chinese have realized that farm productivity is not merely a matter of scientific breakthroughs; it is also a matter of organization and human motivation.

The technological revolution is pushing back all the frontiers on earth, in the oceans, and in space. While we cannot expect these advances to solve all the world's problems, neither can we any longer speak in Malthusian terms of inevitable shortages of food, energy, forests, or clean air and water. In the decades ahead, science may find new ways to feed the world's poor -- already we can only look in wonder at how increased farm productivity has made it possible for a small percentage of Americans to produce enough food for a significant portion of the world's people.

We may discover new sources of energy and learn how to use existing sources more effectively -- already we see that past predictions of energy scarcity were greatly exaggerated. We may see new breakthroughs in transportation and communication technologies, which will inevitably bring the world closer together -- think back on the state of these technologies forty years ago, and imagine what will be possible forty years hence.

Change -- and progress -- will be constant so long we maintain an open society where men and women are free to think, to explore, to dream, and to transform their dreams into reality. We would have it no other way. And in a society devoted to the good of all, a society based on the fundamental understanding that the free pursuit of individual happiness can benefit everyone, we can have confidence that the products of science will be put to beneficial uses, if we remain true to our heritage and our ideals.

Therefore, we retain our faith in the promise of progress. Americans have always relished innovation; we have always embraced the future. As President Reagan put it, we must have a "vision that sees tomorrow's dreams in the learning and hard work we do today."

# PRESS DEPARTMENT OF STATE



March 7, 1985  
NO. 41A

Q&A SESSION  
BY THE  
THE HONORABLE GEORGE P. SHULTZ  
SECRETARY OF STATE  
BEFORE THE  
NATIONAL ACADEMY OF SCIENCES  
WASHINGTON, D. C.  
MARCH 6, 1985

SECRETARY SHULTZ: I have been rash enough to say that I'll answer questions for a while. Or I would be delighted to listen to comments, as I don't often get a chance to be educated by such an eminent group, but help yourself.  
(Laughter)

QUESTION: Mr. Secretary, do you see any possibility, feasibility or probability of cooperating with the Soviet Union in regard to a major space exploration project? I've heard something about this in recent months but not in recent weeks.

SECRETARY SHULTZ: Well, there are a variants of that. We have proposed -- the President proposed -- to the Soviet Union, for example, that we conduct a space rescue experiment and see what we would do if we have some astronauts up there and they get in trouble, as happened with one of the Soviet ships. We might work together to do something about that.

Of course, the President's Strategic Defense Initiative, on a different matter -- and I don't know whether this is what you had in mind -- offers an example, because the President has the view that if we find the technology is there to deal at least in large part with strategic defense, then we need to have a negotiated transition in which we move from an offense-only doctrine of deterrence to one that has a perhaps greater and greater element of defense in it. And if you are to move to that in a stable fashion, ideally you would do it through a negotiated process.

So that is a great adventure. There may be others that I'm not aware of. Jim Biggs probably could give you a better answer. He's around here somewhere.



QUESTION: Mr. Secretary, I think one of the rather remarkable financial movements in any recent history is the movement of the dollar against the rest of the currencies, and it doesn't seem to be settling down (inaudible).

How many problems do you see coming out of that in the next year or two?

SECRETARY SHULTZ: Plenty. (Laughter) It's something of a puzzle, because while many people have said it must be due to high interest rates, we have seen that as interest rates decline the dollar has risen.

I'm reminded of a remark I'm told a Lord Rothschild of a hundred or so years ago made, that "water may flow downhill but money flows to the right," (Laughter) by which he meant toward the aversion of risk along with return. It does seem that the United States right now is a place that people believe has a relatively high risk-averted rate of return, and so we've been attracting funds.

I think that we should encourage other countries to take a lesson and to provide an environment that's more attractive to investment.

In fact, I think, from the standpoint of the sort of gross financial problems of the world, it must be clear to people by now that financing future expansion in economic development around the world will not come about through commercial bank lending -- we've been there -- and will not come about through increases in concessional aid.

If it comes about, it will come about through funds that come in the form of equity, of ownership, of that kind of investment -- a form of investment that has tended to be resisted, if not rejected, in many developing countries. They have to learn, with all due respect to whatever bankers there may be in the room, that debt is dead. All debt wants is to get paid back. Otherwise, it doesn't care, and wants its interest.

Equity cares. Equity has a stake. Equity brings drive; equity brings technological know-how; equity brings access to markets. Also equity brings the fact that if things go sour, it doesn't get paid anything. There isn't any automatic interest.

So I think a big lesson that people have to learn is how to make themselves attractive to that kind of money, and right

now the United States is perhaps more attractive than any place else, with all of our problems -- and I know we have plenty -- but the high dollar which is a result not of what one would get solely on the basis of trade flows but rather as a reflection of these great financial flows to the United States. It's a kind of Switzerland effect, you might say.

We are like Switzerland right now, and the dollar strength is a result of that. And so it is playing havoc with our trade relationships in a manner that really can't endure. We can't run these kinds of deficits indefinitely. We all know that.

And it also, I think, carries a danger that it will distort the characteristics of our own industrial base as very competitive products made in the United States are priced out of world markets, not because of anything done here but because of what happens to the dollar.

So it's a big a problem, and I wish I could tell you 1, 2, 3/A, B, C what to do about it, but I'm thinking about it very hard. It's kind of out of my jurisdiction as the Secretary of State, but I'm going to make a talk on the subject and get everybody straightened out one of these days. (Laughter and Applause).

QUESTION: In an effort, I guess, to maximize your presence, part of us today spent the day on a topic (inaudible) close to the Secretary of State.

We discussed the question of how Foreign Service Officers might better be prepared to deal with problems related to science and technology policy.

We heard today a promising speech at noontime from Assistant Secretary Malone. And then we were reminded of (inaudible) we discussed the same problems back in the 1950s.

The question to you is, what is your estimate -- what does it take to get the professional staff of the State Department to better deal with problems of science technology policy in the pursuit of their jobs?

SECRETARY SHULTZ: I think they do a reasonable job now. But with respect to, I think, your valid comment about discussing the same problem at different points in time, I think you have to divide problems, in a sense, into two classes. There

are some problems that you can solve, tie a ribbon around them and that's it. And there are other problems that you don't solve. You just work at them perpetually.

I think the problem of, in the balance of things, trying to see that our career service is appropriately educated on a given topic, whether it be science and technology or economics and commercial relationships or political relationships around the world or historical problems or whatever, is not a problem you solve and put a ribbon around. It's a problem you work at all the time.

One of the things that we have in the State Department and which we intend to improve -- although it's good now -- is the Foreign Service Institute. It's a first-class educational enterprise that is designed to help Foreign Service Officers, and also people from other agencies, learn about the problems to be coped with around the world; learn about languages -- we have one of the outstanding language schools anywhere -- and many other matters. Right now, it's spread all over the place. It has no reasonable facility at all, and we believe we are on the way to having a decent facility for it. As with all government enterprises, it will be decades before the decision finally gets implemented, but we're on the way.

At any rate, I think that is the kind of thing that is in and will be more powerful in the offerings there. That helps as well, of course, of -- people learn because they have to tend to the flow of problems that confront them. And on the whole, the Foreign Service Officers are very able, to begin with. We have a great ability to select. There are many, many more people who want to become Foreign Service Officers than we can take. So if we get dumbbells, it's our own fault. A lot of smart people want to be in the group, and they get sorted out as their careers go on.

Of course, one the things they become adept at, and properly so, as all of you do, too, is when something comes along that you have to cope with and it's new to you, or somewhat familiar but not really familiar, you learn how to roll up sleeves and learn about it and don't be afraid of it. Reach out and ask and learn. That trait, I think, is something that we very much seek to impart in the Foreign Service.

Well, Frank said that was the last question. So be it. Thank you very much.

(Applause)

(Q&A Session concluded at 9:30 p.m.)