

CONFIDENTIAL



Foreign and Commonwealth Office

London SW1A 2AH

14 December 1984

CP 14/12.

Dear Charles,

Visit of Mr Gorbachev: Lunch and Discussions with the Prime Minister at Chequers: 16 December

in folder attached to file.

We have gone through the briefs which we prepared last week for the Prime Minister to see whether any up-dating is required. There are minimal changes, and I am enclosing two pages only:

- (a) East/West relations (regional issues): a new version of the first page of the Essential Facts which takes account of the confirmation of Deputy Prime Minister Arkhipov's visit to China;
- (b) UK/Soviet relations: an additional paragraph at the end of the Essential Facts on the 1975 "Protocol on Consultations", in case Mr Gorbachev should mention it.

in folder

I am also attaching two documents which may be of interest to the Prime Minister for this meeting:

- (a) the text of the communique issues from the North Atlantic Council Ministerial Meeting today;
- (b) a copy of Mr Gorbachev's speech on ideology of 11 December, together with two telegrams from our Ambassador in Moscow giving the main points of the speech and a short commentary on it.

✓

Finally, I attach two copies of the official programme for Mr Gorbachev and, for information, a copy of the speech which the Secretary of State will deliver at his lunch for Mr Gorbachev on 17 December.

Yours ever,

Colin Budd

(C R Budd)
Private Secretary

C D Powell Esq
10 Downing Street

CONFIDENTIAL



ESSENTIAL FACTS

Far East

1. Soviet Union publicly critical of increases in Japanese defence spending, accusations of militarism. Russians refuse to discuss territorial dispute over Northern Territories; as a result Japanese cannot envisage progress on bilateral issues. Japanese face half of all SS20s targetable against East Asia.
2. Russians concerned by increased Chinese links with West. Talks on "normalisation" of relations (fifth round held in October), but no progress so far - no sign of Soviet readiness to make concessions on three "obstacles" of greatest concern to China: Vietnamese occupation of Cambodia; Afghanistan; and Soviet troops and SS20s on Chinese border and troops in Mongolia.
3. Deputy Prime Minister Arkhipov due to visit Peking in May, but postponed at last minute by Russians, probably because of Chinese military action against Vietnamese. Now announced that visit will take place from 21 December. Economic co-operation likely to be main subject of discussion.

Central America

4. Supply of Soviet/East European arms to Nicaragua continues to increase. Americans have made clear to Russians they will destroy any MIGs delivered.
5. Russians state they support Contadora process; see guarantee for Nicaragua on non-aggression by US as most important element. Criticise US for policy of "state



[final page of
Essential facts:
UK/Soviet relations
brief]

8. 1975 Protocol on Consultations: Gorbachev may refer to this. Agreement to consult at official level on wide range of international and bilateral issues, and for regular meetings between Foreign Ministers or their representatives. Russians regard it as formal basis for Anglo-Soviet political contacts. We take a more pragmatic approach. But certainly in 1984 its provisions had been reflected in practice.

SPEECH BY THE RT HON SIR GEOFFREY HOWE QC MP
AT A LUNCH IN HONOUR OF MR GORBACHEV
AT HAMPTON COURT ON 17 DECEMBER 1984

It gives me very great pleasure formally to welcome Mr Gorbachev to this country on behalf of the British Government.

We first met yesterday at the lunch and talks with the Prime Minister at Chequers. And we held further talks this morning.

In this relatively short period, we have covered a lot of ground. We have each put forward rather different views. And there have been points of disagreement. But the atmosphere has been businesslike throughout. And I am grateful for Mr Gorbachev's part in making it so.

East/West relations has been one of the major preoccupations of this Government since I became Foreign Secretary. It is a subject on which much has been spoken and written in the West. Rightly so. Because it impinges on us all. On our security, our future, our prosperity, with greater effect than any other single aspect of foreign policy.

I would like to mention today two or three thoughts which relate to this theme. These thoughts formed part of the talks which Mr Gorbachev has had with myself and the Prime Minister and which he will have in Parliament tomorrow.

A convenient starting point is the recognition that we have different policies and governmental systems. This distinction between the way our two systems work in practice can give rise to different perceptions of what we are aiming to achieve.

However, in spite of the differences between us, we both recognise the fundamental fact that we all live on one planet. Mrs Thatcher said it in Washington last year; Mr Chernenko used much the same words in an interview with NBC last month. This recognition compels us to get down to the business of living together in the most constructive way possible. In mutual respect. In awareness of each other's legitimate interests.

And this planet is becoming smaller in almost every respect except the purely physical!

Technology is accelerating the pace of change; transport and electronic communications are faster. Trends of trade and economic development are making us more interdependent. This creates new links between us. But it also makes us more aware that many of our problems are not soluble through purely national action.

The British are an island race. This makes us more aware of the need not to be insular, or insulated from the world outside. Our recent history shows this. Since the last war Britain has committed itself increasingly and wholeheartedly to the building of a united Western Europe.

We have contributed greatly, in every field. We have learned much, too. Above all we have learned the value of working together with our partners in the European Community. This is not only a way to achieve better results than any of us could achieve individually; it is a way to safeguard the peace. The founders of the European Community saw that the way to prevent war from breaking out between the nation states of Europe was to break down barriers, encouraging the free flow of trade and people. This principle has made great progress since then throughout the whole of Western Europe. We have virtually abandoned tariff frontiers between the Community and the countries of the European Free Trade Association.

I would hope to see trading, political and other links of all kinds between the Western and Eastern Europe increase. This need not mean trespassing on anyone's rights. Or challenging any nations' individual achievements.

Britain and the Soviet Union have both experienced the horrors of war. Both know what it is to make real sacrifices. The scale of the sacrifices made by the Soviet Union has been very much in our minds this year. But the anniversaries of the end of the war will have been pointless if they merely glory in past heroism. Equally pointless if they attempt to reopen the wounds of that time.

We have something real to celebrate - 40 years of peace in Europe; Europe at peace for longer than at any time this century. A time of reconciliation. A time to look forward, rather than to look back. It has bred a determination, which is shared by both our countries, that war and the terrible destruction it brings must not be allowed to happen again. Let us use that determination to goad us on to more active steps to reduce tension.

And it is not simply the reduction of tension, but the reduction of numbers of weapons that we would wish to see.

Economic commonsense alone argues that there must be better ways to proceed than to go on living with arms at their present levels. With every year, weapons - conventional or nuclear - are becoming more sophisticated, and more expensive. The man in the street, whether in London or Leningrad, meets the bill. There are pressures therefore - operating differently - but real pressures all the same, to release money spent on defence for more constructive investment.

The awesome responsibilities that flow from the possession of nuclear weapons increase these pressures. We in the West need no more reminding of the uniquely terrible destruction such weapons can wreak than you do in the East.

There can be no real winners in a nuclear conflict. So we share an urgent and common interest in working together to find ways to reduce our dependence on large nuclear forces, to preserve security but at less risk and at lower cost.

In certain fundamental respects our basic objectives are the same. The CMEA Declaration in June said that "no world problem, including the historic dispute between socialism and capitalism, can be resolved militarily". I would not challenge a word of that.

And yet progress in arms control over the last few years has been frustratingly small. The vital ingredient missing is confidence. That confidence can be built. It will come through the better mutual understanding that can arise from more frequent contact between East and West. It will come through the certainty that each side will act in the way it says it will. Only thus can we hope to achieve verifiable agreements, in which each side's security is guaranteed.

This is why we have welcomed warmly the news that Mr Gromyko and Mr Shultz are to meet next month. I hope this will be just the first of many steps along the path towards greater East/West confidence and security at reduced levels of weapons.

I have spoken of the need for states to live together, to work together more closely, to reduce international tensions. But what of the quality of life itself?

It is a feature of the last quarter of the 20th century that more people probably know more about the rest of the world than ever before. Radio and television are able to bring culture of the highest quality into all our homes. Our people have been able for example to see the treasures of the Hermitage. They have been inside the Kremlin. We are right to welcome and encourage this trend. It can only make people better educated, more aware as both national and international citizens.

But it is one of the mistakes of our time to believe that the image is as good as the real thing. The performance of the symphony is in the concert hall, not on the gramophone record; the play in the theatre, not on the TV screen. When human contact is absent, a vital element is missing.

One could not fail to be touched by the meeting a couple of months ago in this country between an 80 year old Soviet citizen, Mr Terletskiy, and his son, who is now a Member of our Parliament. They were reunited for the first time in over 40 years. I am grateful to Mr Gromyko and the Soviet authorities for making this visit possible.

But I ask myself why this number could not be multiplied by hundreds or thousands. I hope that one of the fruits of better relations will be a considerable increase in the number of contacts between ordinary individuals, as well as politicians and diplomats.

The Helsinki Final Act is a good and important document. One of its great virtues is the effort to bring policy down to human level. It made clear that human rights, economic relations, security, the freer flow of information are all part of the same picture, a picture that focuses on the rights and needs of the human individual.

As the Final Act itself says:

"all the principles set forth above are of primary significance and accordingly, they will be equally and unreservedly applied".

Policy without people is an empty shell. And relations between governments can only be of limited depth, if there are no relations between individuals to support them. Contacts between their Parliamentary representatives are also important. So I hope that, while continuing to fill out our bilateral relations - and your visit, Mr Gorbachev, is a significant step in that process - we can also seek to expand the human part of that relationship. We must strive for much freer contact between ordinary people and families throughout Eastern and Western Europe.

My main purpose at this moment, however, is to welcome Mr Gorbachev to Britain. I am glad that Mrs Gorbacheva has also been able to come. I hope that your visit will enable both of you to meet a wide range of people here. I hope that you will carry back a picture of Britain as a country ready to do more business with you, interested in what goes on in the Soviet Union, and keen to fill out the relations between us into something both substantial and long-lasting. Certainly that is the hope of the Government. I am sure it was also that of the Parliamentarians who invited you and your delegation here.

We are most grateful to the British Group of the Inter-Parliamentary Union for providing the occasion for us all to meet. It is with great pleasure therefore that I welcome you all to the United Kingdom.