

The Washington Post

Index			
Classified	C 8	Obituaries	C 6
Editorials	D 6	Outlook	D 1
Employment	L 1	Show	H 1
Financial	K 1	Sports	F 1
Food	B 1	Style	G 1
Metro	C 1	Travel	E 1

© 1984 The Washington Post Company

SUNDAY, SEPTEMBER 30, 1984

Higher in Area Approximately 75 Miles From District of Columbia See Box on A2

\$1.00



bags of rice from North Korean trucks in Demilitarized Zone. The North Korean rice was sent south for victims of flood. (Associated Press)

Reagan Promises Soviets 'Fair Deal'; Gromyko Departs

By Don Oberdorfer
Washington Post Staff Writer

President Reagan yesterday promised the Soviet Union "a fair deal" if it seeks negotiation and peace as Soviet Foreign Minister Andrei A. Gromyko ended his far-ranging meetings with top U.S. officials.

Reagan's statement came in his weekly paid radio address as Gromyko completed a wrap-up meeting with Secretary of State George P. Shultz. Afterward, the Soviet foreign minister avoided comment and took off for Moscow in his special Aeroflot plane about 5 p.m. from Andrews Air Force Base without casting further light on the results of his meetings here.

Shultz told reporters in a brief interchange after his State Department session with Gromyko that their "substantive discussion" produced agreement to "keep in touch not casually but carefully through diplomatic channels."

The White House quoted Shultz as telling Reagan, who was at the presidential retreat at Camp David, in a telephoned report that "we have established a necessary milestone on the way to more stable relations."

Shultz told Reagan the two sides gained "a far better understanding" of one another's purposes after the meetings with Gromyko and said there is hope for establishment of "more regular discourse" between the two nations.

The Soviet news agency Tass, in a generally positive report on yesterday's session between Shultz and Gromyko, said the two sides agreed their "representatives" will meet in the future to discuss regional and other issues, as needed. [Details on Page A3.]

There was no assertion by White House or State Department officials that Gromyko's visit with Reagan Friday or his meetings with Shultz Wednesday and yesterday had brought a breakthrough in any of the global, regional or bilateral issues. See GROMYKO, A13, Col. 1

Soviet's Visit Set In Secrecy

By Lou Cannon
and David Hoffman
Washington Post Staff Writers

President Reagan's first meeting with a high-level Soviet official was proposed by his diplomats and planned at the White House amid extraordinary secrecy out of concern that Pentagon officials would attempt to torpedo the meeting before it occurred, according to administration officials.

These officials said Reagan endorsed the idea of inviting Soviet Foreign Minister Andrei A. Gromyko to a White House meeting when it was suggested this summer, telling advisers he thought he could be effective in face-to-face discussions.

The idea came from Secretary of State George P. Shultz and national security affairs adviser Robert C. McFarlane.

But Reagan ordered at the time that the invitation to Gromyko be closely held among a few top advisers. Officials said there was concern both at the White House and State Department that the Pentagon would shoot down the meeting if the invitation became widely known, a reflection of deep internal divisions over arms control that have persisted in Reagan's presidency.

Defense Secretary Casper Weinberger said the invitation was made in secret. See VISIT, A12, Col. 1

Issue of U.S. Embassy Security Stalks Another Administration

By Fred Hiatt
Washington Post Staff Writer

Four years ago, after the U.S. Embassy in Iran had been sacked and diplomats were being held hostage in Tehran, candidate Ronald Reagan was on the offensive:

"We had adequate warning that there was a threat to our embassy, and we could have done what other embassies did," Reagan told President Jimmy Carter in a debate. "Either strengthen our security there, or remove our personnel."

Last week, after a terrorist had desecrated the U.S. Embassy annex in Beirut, Reagan's perspective seemed to have changed:

"Remember, an embassy is not a bunker," he said. "You can't build a fortress and hunker down. You're there to do business with the people of that country."

For the second presidential election in a row, the security of embassies, once considered among the diplomatic outposts, has become an issue. Most of the installations in the Middle East are being dismantled or closed. In Beirut, the U.S. Embassy annex was destroyed in a terrorist attack. In London, the U.S. Embassy was bombed in a terrorist attack. In Manila, the U.S. Embassy was bombed in a terrorist attack. In Rome, the U.S. Embassy was bombed in a terrorist attack. In Tehran, the U.S. Embassy was sacked and diplomats were held hostage. In Iran, the U.S. Embassy was sacked and diplomats were held hostage.

Administration officials and congressional critics alike agreed last week that no facility can be made impregnable. But they also agreed that, Reagan's disclaimers notwithstanding, more could and should have been done to protect the U.S. Embassy annex outside Beirut before it was bombed Sept. 20.

With State Department investigators still in Lebanon and many witnesses dead or injured, much about the most recent attack remains murky. But during the 10 days following the bombing, two key questions have emerged:

- Why did the U.S. Embassy move from a well-fortified site in west Beirut to a virtually undefended site in east Beirut, allowing the withdrawal of 90 Marine guards at the same time, only seven weeks before the bombing?

- Why, despite past experience and recent specific threats, despite 17 months of gearing up to defend against suicide bombers, were the most elementary defenses against car bombs not in place?

Answers to those questions seemed partial to be in a State Department all prepared at least until recently to be sent to Tehran in a bureaucracy. See EMBASSY, A26, Col. 1

U.S. Urges Allies to Reject Contadora Plan

By Robert J. McCartney
Washington Post Foreign Service

MEXICO CITY, Sept. 29—The United States is urging its allies in Central America to reject a regional peace treaty as it now stands, leading some governments in the area to doubt that a negotiated settlement is possible there, diplomatic sources said this week.

Special envoy for Central America Harry W. Claudeman and other U.S. diplomats have been quietly pressing El Salvador, Honduras and Costa Rica over the past two weeks to demand changes in a comprehensive treaty proposed earlier this month by the Contadora group of four Latin American nations, according to well-placed officials. The U.S. effort already appears to have borne fruit, as these three countries in the past week have

have backed off from previous, unofficial expressions of support for the treaty that would set limits on arms purchases and the size of armies and restrict military activity by countries outside the region. Diplomatic sources now predict that the three U.S. allies either will seek revisions before signing the pact or will sign it while expressing major reservations that would render it ineffective.

In particular, the U.S. allies are expected to seek tougher enforcement provisions to guarantee that the left-wing government in Nicaragua curbs its military buildup and halt support for guerrillas in El Salvador, diplomats said. For its part, the Nicaraguan government says that it has no guarantees that the U.S. allies will respect their pledges to stop cross-border attacks by the Nicaraguan army.

Nicaraguan junta leader Daniel Ortega said in an interview in Managua that the United States is trying to torpedo the Contadora pact because it would mean a decrease in U.S. influence in Central America, special correspondent John Lantigua reported.

[Ortega, who is scheduled to arrive in New York Sunday for a speech to the U.N. General Assembly, said that while the Contadora agreement would diminish the U.S. military presence in Central America it would also prevent the Soviet Union and Cuba from increasing their influence in the region.]

Nicaragua announced last week that it accepted the treaty as now drafted. The move surprised. See CONTADORA, A28, Col. 5

■ European officials promise political and economic reforms.



HARRY W. CLAUDEMAN

president that the

Reagan Pledges 'A Fair Deal' For Soviet Union

GROMYKO, From Al

sues that were discussed. Officials said they do not anticipate early word from Moscow about resuming the suspended nuclear arms control negotiations or beginning talks on weapons in space.

Reagan, in his radio address, said he and Gromyko "didn't seek to gloss over the hard issues that divide our two countries." He added, "I made plain to Mr. Gromyko what it is about Soviet behavior that worries us and our allies."

The president went on to describe his first discussions with a senior Soviet leader as "useful talks."

He said, "I made it clear that we Americans have no hostile intentions toward his country and that we're not seeking military superiority toward the U.S.S.R.," as Gromyko had charged in his address to the United Nations Thursday.

"I told him, 'If your government wants peace, then there will be peace,'" Reagan said.

Reagan concluded by saying that the Soviets return home to "ponder our exchanges" with the knowledge that, while inflexibility will not gain advantages for them, "they will get a fair deal if they seek the path of negotiation and peace."

A White House official said the Soviet visitors "didn't come with new ideas." He said the substance of Gromyko's private discussions with the president as well as his tone was as unyielding as the veteran Soviet minister's address to the United Nations and his report through Tass Friday that he detected "no visible signs" of realistic U.S. positions in his meeting with Reagan.

After all that Gromyko said in the meeting with Reagan, the White House official suggested, holding a follow-up meeting yesterday was a sign of perseverance on both sides. "We might not have wanted to meet again" after some of the things that were said Friday, he observed.

According to the White House account of the Reagan-Gromyko meeting, the president said the United States is prepared to take flexible positions if the Soviets return to the negotiations on reduction of strategic nuclear arms and begin new discussions centering on prevention of weapons in space.

Officials said that, as examples, Reagan cited U.S. willingness to contemplate "trade-offs" between various types of nuclear weapons in resumed strategic arms reduction talks (START) and possible U.S. agreement to "restraints" on anti-satellite testing if space talks go forward. "He lifted the cover a little bit about what we would do at the [negotiating] table," an official said. A variety of U.S. sources said, however, that details of such future U.S. positions were not given to Gromyko.

While seeming to be inflexible in his positions on international issues, the 75-year-old Gromyko was accommodating in his personal demeanor, exchanging smiles in public with Reagan and posing with Shultz at the State Department in a handshake for cameras as the secretary of state suggested.