92d Congress
1st Session

COMMITTEE PRINT

INTERVIEW WITH KOSYGIN

REPORT

TO THE

COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS
UNITED STATES SENATE

BY

Senator FRANK CHURCH, Idaho

Member of the Delegation of the United States

to the

Sixth Dartmouth Conference, Kiev, U.S.S.R.

OCTOBER 1971

Printed for the use of the Committee on Foreign Relations

U.S. GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE

67-888 WASHINGTON : 1971

COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS

J. W. FULBRIGHT, Arkansas, *Chairman*

JOHN SPARKMAN, Alabama
MIKE MANSFIELD, Montana
FRANK CHURCH, Idaho
STUART SYMINGTON, Missouri
CLAIBORNE PELL, Rhode Island
GALE W. McGEE, Wyoming
EDMUND S. MUSKIE, Maine
WILLIAM B. SPONG, JR., Virginia

GEORGE D. AIKEN, Vermont
KARL E. MUNDT, South Dakota
CLIFFORD P. CASE, New Jersey
JOHN SHERMAN COOPER, Kentucky
JACOB K. JAVITS, New York
HUGH SCOTT, Pennsylvania
JAMES B. PEARSON, Kansas

CARL MARCY, *Chief of Staff*
ARTHUR M. KUHL, *Chief Clerk*

LETTER OF TRANSMITTAL

OCTOBER 5, 1971.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: This Summer, you will recall, I journeyed to the Soviet Union for the purpose of attending the Sixth Dartmouth Conference, held in Kiev.

Upon the conclusion of the Conference, I was one of four members of the American delegation to be invited back to Moscow for an interview with the Soviet Prime Minister, Alexei Kosygin. It was the first time in six months that Mr. Kosygin had granted an audience to American visitors.

The interview, which lasted for nearly two and a half hours, covered such subjects as arms control, the United Nations, problems of the environment, and prospects for expanding American-Soviet trade.

Presenting the substance of that interview is the primary purpose of this report.

Sincerely,

FRANK CHURCH.

INTRODUCTION

For ten days in July, from the 9th through the 18th, I visited the Soviet Union to attend the Dartmouth Conference in Kiev. First held at Dartmouth College in 1960, from which it derives its name, subsequent meetings of the conference have been held alternately in the United States and the Soviet Union during the intervening years. This was the Sixth such meeting, and the first to be attended by United States Senators. My Senatorial colleague on the American delegation was Mark O. Hatfield of Oregon.

Others in the American group included: General James M. Gavin, the Chairman, presently of Arthur D. Little, Inc.; Dr. Milton S. Eisenhower, President of The Johns Hopkins University; Mr. Lloyd N. Hand, former Chief of U.S. Protocol; Ambassador Patricia Harris; now a prominent black attorney in Washington, D.C.; Dr. George B. Kistiakowsky, Professor of Chemistry at Harvard University, who formerly served as Special Assistant to President Eisenhower for Science and Technology. Others were: Dr. Thomas F. Malone, Dean of the Graduate School, University of Connecticut, one of the nation's foremost environmentalists; Dr. Samuel Pisar, a brilliant American attorney who resides in Paris, and author of a new book on East-West trade entitled, "Commerce and Co-Existence;" Ambassador Charles W. Yost, formerly Permanent U.S. Representative of the United Nations; and Mr. David Rockefeller, Chairman of the Chase Manhattan Bank.

A complete list of the American and Russian participants, along with short biographical data pertaining to each, appear in Appendix C of this report.

The agenda of the conference included discussion of three major topics: East-West Trade, the environment, and the United Nations. A general summation of the conclusions reached by the conferees is contained in the joint communique, issued at the close of the meeting, which forms Appendix B of this report.

Although we spent most of our time in Kiev, we also visited Moscow, travelling by train between the two cities, and we had some opportunity to motor into the countryside, as well. My impressions of the Soviet Union, drawn from this limited exposure, were so similar to those of Senator Hatfield that I have made an excellent article of his, published recently in the *Oregonian*, Appendix A of this report. Senator Hatfield departed Russia the day before we received notification that Mr. Kosygin had granted us the interview.

My summary, set forth below, of our conversation with the Soviet Prime Minister is based, in part, on notes I made at the time. I am particularly indebted to Ambassador Yost for the detailed notes he furnished me, which I have used to supplement my own. His long experience in recording exchanges of this kind, together with my

personal recollection of the conversation, lead me to believe that this report is as accurate as it can be made, given the lack of a verbatim transcript and the possibility of some slippage in translation. In the interest of objectivity, I have tried to avoid editorializing, or interjecting my personal evaluation of any of Mr. Kosygin's remarks. My purpose is simply to give a factual narrative account of the interview, as it occurred.

Of course, no recitation of questions and answers can convey the full flavor of such an interview. Some attempt must be made to describe Mr. Kosygin's manner and mood. He was, for the most part, quiet-spoken and reflective. Obviously a man of high intelligence, he gave the impression of being extremely knowledgeable about all factors of the Soviet government.

Unlike his predecessor, Nikita Khrushchev, Mr. Kosygin abstained from theatrics, wasting little time scoring debating points. He was not especially argumentative, and he eschewed the tedious recital of Russian grievances against the United States which so often occurs in exchanges with Soviet officials. Indeed, there was a minimum of polemics. He was attentive throughout, and his answers were responsive to our questions.

One final word about Kosygin's Kremlin office, the scene of the interview. It is a long, rather narrow room. Dark wood paneling extends half way up the walls, which are plastered above and painted beige. Tall, undraped windows line the exterior wall, fitted with white silk curtains. The conference table at which we were seated was covered with green felt. The sofas set against the interior wall were leather and wood, heavily constructed, but plainly designed. Two large drawings in identical frames of Marx and Lenin hung at opposite ends of the room. Mr. Kosygin's desk, located beneath Lenin's picture at the far end, was stacked high with folders containing papers of state. A single desk lamp rested on it, along with three telephones, two white and one red. No family pictures or personal memorabilia were in evidence. The only decoration on the long sidewall was a map of the Soviet Union. The general effect was impersonal and severe. Mr. Rockefeller, who had interviewed Nikita Khrushchev in the same office a few years before, remarked on leaving that nothing in the room had changed except that Mr. Kosygin now sat where Khrushchev had sat before.

The Interview

The interview with Prime Minister Alexei Kosygin took place on the afternoon of July 16, 1971. The American participants, in addition to myself, were General James M. Gavin, Mr. David Rockefeller and Ambassador Charles W. Yost.

General Gavin opened the meeting by expressing his appreciation to the Prime Minister for having received us. He reviewed briefly the subjects which had been discussed at the conference in Kiev from which we had just come—environment, disarmament, the United Nations and Soviet-American trade. At Gavin's request, Mr. Rockefeller gave a short account of the history of the Dartmouth meetings.

The General then offered to discuss in more detail any of the conference subjects about which the Prime Minister might be interested, and remarked that subcommittees of the conference hoped to follow through on common environmental problems and the question of expanding trade between our two countries.

Environmental Problems

Mr. Kosygin remarked that all nations should have begun earlier to cope with the problems of pollution, a subject that had suddenly come to the forefront. Some countries, he observed, are talking about environmental problems merely because it is now fashionable; others are more sincere. Solution to these problems, however, will require a great deal of money. The Soviet Union, Kosygin said, is allocating more money to deal with environmentai problems in its new five-year plan, but there are limits to what can be spent.

General Gavin commented that the experts present at the conference in Kiev spoke favorably of trying to work out a common U.S.-Soviet position for the forthcoming world environment conference to be held in Stockholm next year. He said both sides were agreed that less should be spent on armaments and more on the environment.

Mr. Kosygin replied that this is a sound idea, but the question is how to translate it into action.

Arms Control

I then suggested that the SALT talks might furnish both countries with the key. I acknowledged that the settlement of all our differences would have to await the building of mutual confidence between us. However, keeping in mind the satellite surveillance systems now available to both countries, I said it should be feasible to reach arms-limitation agreements even without full mutual confidence.

The Prime Minister responded that arms control was the focal point in the relationship between the United States and the Soviet Union. On its achievement, he said, depends the settlement of many other problems, including the environment. He noted in the SALT talks that both sides have reason enough to slow down the arms race, both are aware that they have more than enough strategic weapons. Therefore, the status quo must be observed in any agreement, that is, neither side should be enabled to take another leap forward.

Warming to his subject, Kosygin said there were still difficult problems to be overcome at the SALT talks but that he hoped they could be resolved. He assured us that the Soviet Government, on its part, took the talks seriously. However, he felt some measure of confidence would be needed on both sides. Arms, after all, could be conceivably harbored in "closed laboratories" under the pretense of abolition. As for the Soviet Union, he continued, it favored the total abolishment of all nuclear weapons. Even a limited or conventional war between nuclear powers would be likely to escalate into a nuclear holocaust.

Furthermore, even if the United States and the Soviet Union could agree to abolish nuclear weapons, other countries would have to be

drawn in. Otherwise, the balance would be upset. The Prime Minister concluded by saying that his government stood ready to support arms reduction, nuclear or conventional, partial or complete.

I was struck by the impracticality, indeed the impossibility, of achieving complete disarmament in a climate of continuing mistrust. I recounted the difficulty of securing ratification by the United States Senate of the Antarctic treaty, even though it provided for the right of unrestricted inspection of all installations, due simply to deep-seated mistrust. I spoke also of the resistance in the Senate to the limited test ban agreement. In light of this experience, I suggested that progress toward arms control could only be made a step at a time, and expressed the hope that the SALT talks would bring us another step along the way. If our two countries could find a basis for standing together, I said, we could keep the peace of the world; if not, our two countries had the most to lose.

Mr. Kosygin interjected that some countries were still carrying on nuclear weapons tests in the atmosphere. He also noted that the science of detection had reached the point where we can each follow exactly the other's underground tests. Then, turning his attention to my earlier emphasis on lack of trust, the Prime Minister asked how confidence can be created or maintained? During his visit to the United States for the Glassboro meeting with President Johnson, Kosygin said he saw no signs of mistrust in the faces of the American people. He was inclined to think that mistrust is being artificially created. Has the Soviet Union ever gone back on any of its treaty commitments to the United States, he asked? No, he answered. Those who want to prevent agreements use mistrust as a smokescreen. They manufacture and manipulate mistrust. But if one side moves troops into another part of the world, the other will be tempted to respond in the same way and this will undermine confidence. If one side likes to "swim about" in a neutral area, the other will also want to "swim about" there, and that undermines confidence. We must move forward on the basis of equality and thus overcome mistrust.

I remarked that a primary cause of mistrust between the United States and the Soviet Union was the immensity of our respective arsenals. If we could reduce them, this would be the greatest single contribution we could make toward re-establishing confidence between us.

Mr. Kosygin, however, was not to be deflected. It was his opinion that propaganda was largely responsible for creating mistrust, through the press, radio and TV. He had seen, during his visit to the United States, the scale of the propaganda campaign against Russia. If this were reversed, it would be a giant step toward restoring confidence in our relations, he said.

The Prime Minister was speaking now with animation. He was concerned about the fluctuations and zigzagging in U.S. policy. Some of the charges made by American public officials he understood were election ploys, but we should remember that these ploys were not limited to an internal effect. They were often addressed to foreign nations and produced adverse reaction within those nations. This sort of public behavior does not exist in the Soviet Union, he asserted, but in the United States it is normal.

I replied that inasmuch as free speech prevailed in our election campaigns, candidates could make such charges as they pleased. Nevertheless, I said I believed that popular sentiment in the United States strongly favored successful SALT talks and improved American-Soviet relations.

Kosygin appeared to relax. He said that he too was deeply convinced that this was so. Only an abnormal person could even think of conflict between our two countries.

The United Nations

Now it was Ambassador Yost's turn. His subject was the United Nations. If properly strengthened, he pointed out, the United Nations could possess the capacity to reduce any need for intervention by the big powers in other parts of the world.

Mr. Kosygin countered that he would favor strengthening the U.N. but would not want it to become a "world gendarme." He observed that even now there was criticism in the U.N. of a dual hegemony on the part of the U.S. and the U.S.S.R.

Yost persisted. If peacekeping were undertaken through the Security Council, the interest of our two countries could be protected and also the interests of others. The U.N. could become a gendarme to protect the interests of the world community, not infringe upon them.

The Prime Minister said he agreed but added there is often a difference of opinion as to when U.N. action is needed. For instance, the difference of opinion between Israel and the Arabs.

Yost conceded that the U.N. could only intervene with the consent of the governments concerned but that this still left room for substantial action.

The exchange ended with the Prime Minister's statement that Ambassador Yost should know better than anyone else that the Soviets were in favor of strengthening the United Nations.

Soviet-American Trade

David Rockefeller then took up the question of Soviet-American trade. He said that from both the economic and political point of view, it was important to expand peaceful trade between our two countries. He mentioned that the Nixon administration had taken some steps in this direction but he felt more should be done. He said we should work toward the removal of existing obstacles to trade, even though no large increases could be expected in the near future.

Mr. Kosygin took no particular issue with this general assesment. In actual fact, he said, there is no real trade between the two countries since what does take place is so trivial. He said he favored the lifting of formal restrictions, yet made it plain he thought that this was up to the United States. He noted that there are only fifteen U.S. ports at which Soviet ships may call, that they must give notice thirty days in advance and obtain clearance for all members of the crew. In view of these restrictions, he said the Russian Government had retaliated in kind. But under conditions like this, one can't hope that trade will increase. Any trade would have to come in non-Soviet and non-U.S.

ships. Also, he added, Russian ships that call at Cuban ports are blacklisted by the United States and may not afterwards call at any American port.

Kosygin said he favored clearing all this away. To do so would require no concessions on either side, but would merely be a return to normal trade relations. If we can settle the problem of nuclear arms, he remarked, we should be able to arrange for normal trade.

He then suggested we might develop scientific and technological exchanges and explore the question of licenses. He thought it would be possible to adapt certain Soviet plants to meet the requirements of U.S. markets and vice versa. Trade *could* be increased. He was not so pessimistic as Mr. Rockefeller.

Nonferrous metallurgy, he went on, particularly copper, the exploitation of the continental shelf, natural gas and timber, are all possible fields of Russian contribution. The Soviet Union has rich deposits of copper at Udakhan in the Far East, tens of millions of tons. There are also possibilities for the extraction of phosphates, apatites, tin, diamonds, titanium (enormous amounts) and manganese. All of these could be jointly exploited by Soviet and U.S. technicians. working together.

Mr. Rockefeller inquired what form this exploitation might take. What would be the relations between the relevant Soviet agencies and U.S. corporations?

The Prime Minister answered that joint plans could be worked out and contracts drawn up. Under contract, for instance, a U.S. corporation might undertake to deliver a full set of equipment for a particular project. Or the equipment might be partly of U.S. and partly of Soviet origin. Payment could be made in kind, that is, in the product of the project, the refined copper for example.

Here Mr. Kosygin paused and the slightest suggestion of a smile crossed his face. He said he understood that copper was on the American list of strategic materials not to be traded with the Soviet Union. His government, however, felt no similar inhibition; the Soviet Union would be willing to enter into a long-term contract with an American company, making its payments in the extracted copper.

Mr. Rockefeller commented that a U.S. firm would expect to make a profit on its investment. Would that be possible?

Kosygin saw no reason why it couldn't be arranged. The U.S. firm would get the product at an agreed price, in exchange for services rendered, and then sell the product on the world market at whatever price it desired or could obtain. The Japanese, he added, have a small lumber project of this kind in Siberia and are getting timber in payment.

Mr. Rockefeller said he believed something along this line might be worked out. He thought some American firms had such projects underway in Yugoslavia and elsewhere in Eastern Europe.

The Prime Minister, returning to the subject of profits, repeated that he was not sure how this could be arranged but thought the best way would be for the American company to share in the product. For example, he said that Austria was obtaining natural gas from the Soviet Union and paying for it by supplying pipe for the pipeline.

Russia, Kosygin said with evident relish, had earlier sought to buy the pipe in the United States but export licenses had been refused.

He wondered aloud what the United States thought it accomplished with such tactics. "What you refuse to sell us, we simply buy elsewhere." He said it with a shrug of his shoulders, and the two other Russians in the room—the interpreter and a notetaker—looked at each other and smiled appreciatively.

As with Austria, the Prime Minister continued, similar deals have been worked out with Italy and West Germany. France is also interested. The possibility of supplying oil in the same way is now being examined. He suggested that a pilot project might be set up for some particular product. If this proved successful, others could follow. In this regard, the Soviet Union has had quite a bit of experience with the Japanese and cooperation with them is being expanded further. The Soviet Government would be willing to explore comparable arrangements with American companies—perhaps through the Chase Manhattan Bank.

Mr. Rockefeller said he saw three possible lines of approach, all of which could be pursued together: (1) there might be a pilot project such as Mr. Kosygin had suggested; (2) a proposal could be worked out by the bilateral Dartmouth committee which has already been constituted; and (3) the two governments could explore the matter. As to the latter, Rockefeller thought that Mr. Peterson, charged with the oversight of foreign economic affairs at the White House, might be the man to approach.

The Prime Minister said that we, as Americans, would be the best judge of how to proceed in our own country. But whatever is done, he cautioned, should be undertaken seriously, with the full approval of the U.S. Government. Proposals should not be made, only to be overruled later by administrative action, as in the case of the Ford offer.

Mr. Rockefeller asked what agency in the Soviet Government should first be contacted.

Mr. Kosygin replied the State Committee for Science and Technology. The Committee, he said, would serve as a clearing house for submitting proposals to the appropriate ministries. But, he emphasized again, such efforts should not be allowed to just fizzle out. A suitable project should be carefully chosen, the terms worked out in detail with the appropriate Soviet ministry, and the approval of the U.S. Government secured. Both sides must be able to rely upon the agreement reached.

Mr. Rockefeller concluded by saying he would be happy to proceed along these lines.

General Gavin asked whether the Prime Minister had any suggestion as to how inquiries from the press on the meeting should be handled.

Mr. Kosygin replied that his office would issue a brief communique announcing that the meeting had taken place and that the subjects of environment, disarmament and trade had been discussed. He left it to the Americans to say to the U.S. press whatever we considered appropriate, but he expressed the hope that no part of the exchange would be treated in a sensational fashion.

The meeting, which had been cordial throughout, ended with expressions of goodwill on both sides.

APPENDIXES

APPENDIX A

Impressions of the Soviet Union

(By Senator Mark O. Hatfield)

Russia is a land of autocratic mystery, and blends its past majesty with its present dreariness. The most dominant impression came from the simple observation of the way things looked. Our hotel room, just a year old, had door joists which would not gee, and plumbing that you knew wasn't completely trustworthy. Those were small signs of a larger feature evident throughout the country. Getting things done seemed more important than how they are done.

While browsing through stores, watching a new apartment being built, or simply noticing the dress of the Russian people, one becomes immediately aware of the uniform mediocrity, comparatively speaking, that seems to characterize the goods and the workmanship made available for the benefit of the average citizen.

One is initially struck by the drab sameness of things, and the lack of distinctive quality. The sophistication that the Russian government has attempted to achieve in its space and military endeavors seems atypical of much of what one actually "sees" throughout the country. Admittedly, these are immediate and simplistic impressions; yet, during my brief stay in Russia, I began to feel they were reflections of deeper traits throughout the society.

Attendance at the Dartmouth Conference in Kiev (July 12 to 16) was my first trip to the Soviet Union. The Conference was first begun in the last year of Eisenhower's presidency as part of a people-to-people program during a period of thaw in Russian-American diplomatic relations, and as an attempt to stir meaningful dialogue between experts in many fields.

The first conference was held in Dartmouth College in 1959 and this last one, the sixth, was held in Kiev, Russia. For the first time politicians were permitted to participate. Senator Frank Church of Idaho and I represented the Senate.

The agenda of the conference was to discuss East-West trade, the environment, and the United Nations.

Arriving in Moscow, we received red carpet treatment, passed through customs quickly and traveled about an hour from the airport to the city. A short distance from the outskirts, we saw a monument to Russians who had stopped the German tanks in WWII. I did not realize that the Germans had penetrated so closely to Moscow. Once into the city, I was surprised to find that the traffic was heavy. I had expected few autos, but the streets were congested with cars, as well as many trucks.

Most Americans think of Red Square and the Kremlin when they picture the identifying landmarks of Moscow, and these were the places we first visited. I was interested to learn that "Red Square" is not, as I had thought, a name given to the historic center of Moscow since the time of the Communists' rule, but that it actually means in Russian "Beautiful Square." Likewise, "Kremlin" means "Fortress" and consists of the buildings and grounds that have been the site of the past dramas in Russia's long traumatic history. The entire area has a physical beauty and majesty that inspires awe.

General Gavin laid a wreath on the grave of the three cosmonauts on a plot of ground right behind the Kremlin wall. We also saw the grave of John Reed, who was the Oregonian who wrote Ten Days That Shook the World, and is the only American buried in the Kremlin.

The "Kremlin" is an area of many acres, with several buildings all surrounded by an ancient wall. It has always been the seat of Russia's government except for the time after Peter the Great moved the capital to St. Petersburg

(now named Leningrad), where it remained until the Bolshevik Revolution in 1917. Besides holding the offices of the Communist officials, the Kremlin grounds also contain the churches used by the Czars, and their palaces, all of which have been restored as museums. In these magnificent museums, we saw the remnants of Russia's past, including the ornate, jeweled carriages of the Czars and the Faberge jewel collection. Faberge was the Frenchman imported by the royal family to make the jewels (and jeweled Easter eggs) for the Czar and the Church.

I could understand, after seeing the jeweled and bediamonded costumes of the old Russian churchmen who worked hand-in-glove with the Czars to keep the people in subjection, why the Bolshevik Revolution had turned against the Church. An unholy alliance had wedded the authoritarian, orthodox church to the autocratic state; they reinforced each other with their power, attempting to place the divine mandate on their earthly and oppressive government. Thus the Bolsheviks made the church their target, as well as the Czar and the nobility, and destroyed over 3,000 churches in the Moscow area alone.

This glimpse into Russia's past stimulated reflections about her present. Autocracy has not died; it has merely changed its face. Man's innate desire to worship his Creator has not been quenched; rather, new gods have been created, with the hope of imposing them in the place of the God naturally worshipped.

The Russian people have known rule by a stern, authoritarian government through nearly all of their history. The Bolshevik Revolution produced another rotation in the elite who gain and monopolize power, exercising it over the people. The infallibility that the Czars claimed through allegiance to the church is paralleled by the infallibility Russia's present leaders claim by allegiance to Lenin. Self-righteousness has justified authoritarian rule of those who have held power in Russia both before and after the Bolshevik Revolution. One tends to believe that the Russian people have always expected that their rulers be distant, mysterious, all-powerful, omniscient men with a "religious" authority to lead Russia to her destiny.

The worship of Lenin, which can best be described in spiritual terms, underscores this thought. The adoration of his life, his thought, and his spirit, goes far beyond historical regard for a national hero. The hymns, slogans, and legends about his life seem designed to evoke a deeply personal allegiance and dedication. It is as though the Communists had realized that religious expression cannot be obliterated, but have hoped that the object of worship can be transferred.

But the continuing vitality of Christian faith, and the enduring tension between it and the faith of Russia's rulers, all was revealed on a visit to Zagorsk.

We were driven 50 miles out of Moscow to the Holy See of the Russian Orthodox Church, and one of their practicing monastaries—the magnificent cathedral at Zagorsk. Six Russians accompanied us and five had never been to Zagorsk. Only three would go into the church with us where an Orthodox service was in progress. To show their contempt for religion they spoke in loud voices as they commented about the cathedral. The people stood throughout the services, mostly women in babushkas, but also men in military uniform and young people. A deacon, led the singing; in a deep, booming voice. But all through the service, the Russian officials, in obvious disdain for the religious celebration that was taking place, shouted their explanation to us.

Some of us became quite perturbed; but the Communist officials seemed to talk louder as the people sang. Then, at one moment, the music stopped. The deacon gave instructions to the assembled worshippers, and they knelt on the floor. The loud voices of our official hosts echoed throughout the sanctuary. Antoinette, my wife, then knelt with the congregation, and Senator Frank Church's wife Bethine, also dropped to her knees; we all then followed suit. The officials, embarrassed deeply, simply stalked out and left us to our praying. You could just feel the other people's eyes on us and they smiled our way. The sense of identification we suddenly felt with these worshippers was good.

Following our time in Moscow and Zagorsk, we left for Kiev where the formal sessions of the Dartmouth Conference were held. The idea of such a conference, and the opportunity for dialog and communication it presents, is laudable. Yet, there were drawbacks and shortcomings to the structure of the conference. In formal, plenary sessions, the Russians were often more interested in

putting forth their party line than initiating a genuine exchange of opinion. Their statements began with routine denunciations of "American imperialism" and charges that this was the cause of all the turmoil and ill in the world.

At one point, finally, our Chairman, General Gavin, forcefully refuted these contentions, pointing directly to the role the Russians have played in conflicts throughout the world, including the arms they have supplied to our adversaries in both the Korean and Vietnam wars. Since Gavin's credentials, as a military expert who has opposed our intervention in Vietnam, are well known to all, including the Soviets, his reply was most effective. "We cannot and will not accept your propaganda that it is the United States which bears the total responsibility for these conflicts."

I co-chaired the session on the environment and thought that on this subject it would be easier to get beyond the rhetoric and propaganda, and get down to substantive exchange. But Evgenii Federov, an Academician and Chief of the Hydrometerological Service of the USSR began the discussion with more accusations, charging that United States "imperialism has depleted the world's resources with its rapacious appetite in exploiting the world's natural resources," and that "the ultimate answer to the problems of pollution would be when all the nations of the world become socialist states!"

I felt compelled to rejoin, and said, "speaking of rapacious appetites, I would like to speak of the rapacious appetite of the Russian fishing fleet off the coast of Oregon, destroying species of perch and hake." I talked about the possible retribution against their fleet, of setting a 200 mile limit to replace the 12 mile limit, and the seizure of a Russian ship in San Francisco in retaliation for fishing intrusions on our East Coast. I urged them to think of the problem as one of preserving a vital world-wide resource and stressed that they follow up the conference by cooperative efforts by each of our country's experts in the field, working out common-sense methods of preserving the fish of the sea. Dr. Tom Malone, one of our finest environmentalists then proposed a program to come back to Russia and work with his fellow experts in this field.

The Soviets eventually agreed with the proposal, giving us a real hope that our efforts will go beyond discussion into action on this front. Dr. Malone will be returning to the Soviet Union next month.

Further, it was pointed out that the first World Environmental Conference will be held next year in Stockholm. The groundwork laid by Dr. Malone and others in the near future could well produce concrete results in that forum.

There was a worthwhile exchange of information and perspectives as we looked to the future of potential environmental threats which each of our countries faced. For instance, their experts predicted that unless air pollution is brought under control, within 50 to 100 years, there will be so much solid effluent in the world's air that the sun's heat will not get through to the earth, and we will enter into another ice age!

During an afternoon break of the conference in Kiev, Antoinette and I visited one of that city's 500 day care centers where 200 children were cared for. They have an advanced program that is commendable in many respects. A woman doctor at the center checked the children's ears, throat and skin each day and they received a thorough physical exam once a month; the facilities at the center were also modern and more than adequate.

We found that while the Russians spoke the official rhetoric of the party during the formal conference sessions, they were more flexible and down to earth at meals and on social occasions. For instance, Georgii Zhukov, a political commentator of Pravda, Deputy to the Supreme Soviet and Vice President of the Soviet Peace Committee, heard it was my birthday. He came over at dinner, and plopped a huge cake down and said in heavy accent, "Happy Birthday." Lloyd Hand, the former protocol chief for LBJ went up to the orchestra and asked them to play "Happy Birthday" so everyone could sing it to me. But they didn't know the tune. So Hand took a blank sheet of music paper to a young Russian girl at our table who was a music major; she didn't know "Happy Birthday" either, but Hand sang it to her, she copied the notes down and the orchestra played it! Later, after dinner, David Rockefeller's son Dick, played his guitar and everyone sang. Soon Dick had everybody clapping hands and singing, "He's Got the Whole World in His Hands," with the Russians heartily joining in.

Firm conclusions cannot be drawn from brief impressions of one such visit. Certainly, I was made vividly aware of the ideological differences that often prohibited genuine dialogue, and gained a glimpse into the trauma of Russia's past that has left its mark on her contemporary mood and attitude. The divisions between us must never be ignored. It is imperative that we search for ways in which they can be transcended, and that we explore all the possibilities for building avenues for human contact and communication.

While the older Soviet leadership seemed completely infused with the total righteousness of their Party's ideology, the middle-aged and younger Russians revealed a certain subtle detachment from it all at times. For them, the rhetoric seemed a little like a facade. It is with them that the hope of more authentic dialogue in the future lies. For as we all learn to temper our self-righteousness, we open the doors to honest relationships.

APPENDIX B

Joint Communique of the VIth Dartmouth Conference

The sixth regular meeting of the representatives to the Dartmouth Conference from the United States and the Soviet Union met in Kiev on the 12–16 of July. (These meetings are known as the Dartmouth Conferences because the first meeting of this type took place at Dartmouth College in 1960. The four subsequent meetings have convened alternately in the USA and the USSR.) Problems of Soviet-American trade relations were a principal subject of the exchanges at the meeting as well as other problems important to the maintenance of international peace and security.

The participants exchanged views and advanced proposals aimed at achieving a general lessening of international tensions and the improvement of the relations between the USSR and the USA. Both sides presented their ideas for working more effectively toward world peace. The Soviet participants informed their American colleagues on the contents of the peace programme advanced by the XXIV Congress of the CPSU, that, in the Soviet view, presents a sound basis for the improvement of international relations in this decade. The American participants presented proposals on ways of promoting international cooperation, particularly in the fields of international trade, the strengthening of the United Nations, and the protection of the human environment.

The participants were unanimous in considering that the improvement in Soviet-American relations would serve the vital interests of the Soviet and American peoples and recognized the utility of promoting mutually beneficial relations of a permanent and stable nature.

The participants expressed their conviction that real possibilities exist for the promotion of a greater volume of Soviet-American trade, for cooperation in the field of industry and for more meaningful exchanges in the areas of science, technology and management. The preliminary meeting of minds which was reached on certain trade matters was, in their view, a welcome development. They expressed the hope that this understanding would open the way to further and more effective promotion of Soviet-American commerce.

The conference favored the normalization of trade relations, through the elimination of laws and practices which restrict the free flow of trade in non-strategic items, and felt confident that improvements in the conditions of trade can be achieved despite existing differences in institutions, laws and customs.

The conference expressed the conviction that the growth of Soviet-American commerce and other forms of economic cooperation would help to improve the political climate and contribute to the settlement of outstanding political issues.

In the course of the meeting, both sides stressed that the United Nations Organization is an instrument of great importance for keeping world peace and international security.

Both sides agreed that the effectiveness of the United Nations for this purpose should be strengthened. Both sides also agreed that this could be achieved if the member-states intensify their efforts to reinforce the authority of and use to the utmost the resources available to the United Nations for maintenance of international peace and security as well as for related purposes.

The participants reached firm agreement on the importance of the human environment and the necessity of cooperation in the rational development and utilization of natural resources and the enhancement of the quality of the environment. Unless attacked vigorously, they agreed, this matter will reach critical proportions within a matter of several decades.

The rapidly increasing effect of industry, agriculture and other types of human activity on the environment, including the atmosphere and water, may lead after several decades to dangerous disruptions in the natural processes of nature.

It was agreed that urgent measures are needed to prevent environmental pollution on a national and international scale and to broaden studies of the possible

consequences to the world and to human life resulting from the release of heat and other influences.

The participants agreed that the rational utilization of the natural resources of our planet as a whole in the interests of mankind, as well as the healthy interaction of human society with the environment, urgently require peaceful coexistence of states with different social systems. Close international cooperation is required, including the possibility of launching, by concerted efforts of different countries, important projects aimed at the conservation and rational transformation of the environment over long periods of time. The planning of these projects will require innovation in institutional arrangements by which the nations of the world may achieve appropriate cooperation. In this connection, the American participants proposed the establishment of a World Environmental Institute. It was agreed that the Dartmouth Conference would continue to consider and work on this matter.

It was felt that the foundations for future cooperation between the two countries exist in the coordination of efforts in the space program between the Soviet Union and the United States, as well as the active participation of scientists of both countries in international programs of oceanic and atmospheric studies. The Conference also saw wide opportunities for developing mutually beneficial relationships in such fields as the prevention and elimination of disease.

The Conference agreed that the arms race must be brought to an end. As arms expenditures decrease, part of the resources released should be used to liquidate environmental pollution and for research into the impact of human activity on nature.

Much attention in the exchanges was concentrated on disarmament and reduction of armaments problems. Conference participants agreed that the armaments race, both in the nuclear and conventional fields, endangers the cause of international peace and security and that the time is ripe for taking specific steps to put an end to the arms race. Each specific step in the direction of general and complete disarmament is a positive contribution to the improvement of the international climate. The Conference participants expressed hope that the agreement reached on the 20th of May on the further progress of Soviet-American talks on the limitation of strategic armaments will be instrumental in arriving at important decisions in the nearest future made in the interests of peace and international security. The participants noted the urgent need of ending as soon as possible the war in Vietnam. They expressed their support of any early and lasting peace in the Middle East. They also noted the importance of constructive agreements, designed to improve the situation in Europe.

The exchanges in Kiev were conducted in the spirit of good will and candor. The Conferences participants are aware of the existence of contradictions and divergent interests between the USSR and the USA, countries with different social and economic systems, and these differences were reflected in the discussions. This notwithstanding, the participants in the Conference recognize that, given good will and a desire to arrive at mutual understanding, real opportunities exist for the improvement of relations between our countries. They expressed the belief that the continuation on a regular basis of the Dartmouth Conferences will maintain contacts with each other for the good of the constructive goals these meetings have been called for.

APPENDIX C

The VIth Dartmouth Meeting, Kiev, 12 July 1971

SOVIET PARTICIPANTS

Korneichuk, Alexander Yevdokimovich, Academician, Writer, Deputy to the Supreme Soviet of the USSR, Vice-president of the Soviet Peace Committee, Co-chairman of the Conference.

Blokhin, Nikolai Nikolayevich, Academician, Director of the Institute of Oncology, President, Institute for Soviet-American Relations; Deputy to the Supreme Soviet of the USSR, Co-chairman of the Conference.

Zhukov, Georgii Alexandrovich, Pravda political commentator, Deputy to the Supreme Soviet of the USSR, Vice-president of the Soviet Peace Committee. Co-chairman.

Fedorov, Evgenii Konstantinovich, Academician, Chief of the Main Directorate of the Hyfrometeorological Service of the U.S.S.R., Vice-president of the Soviet Peace Committee.

Arbatov, Georgii Arkadyevich, Corresponding Member of the Academy of Sciences of the U.S.S.R.,; Director, Institute of the United States of the Academy of Sciences of the U.S.S.R.

Ovcharenko, Fyodor Danilovich, Academician, Public figure.

Orlov, Nikolai Vassilyevich, Director, Market Research Institute USSR Ministry of Foreign Trade.

Andreev, Vassilii Vassilyevich, Deputy Chief, Foreign Trade Department, State Planning Commission (GOSPLAN) of the U.S.S.R.

Prikhodov, Yuri Kondratyevich, Vice-chairman, Chamber of Commerce of the U.S.S.R.

Masevich, Alla Genrikhovna, Doctor of Sciences (Physics and Mathematics); Deputy Chairman, Astronomical Council of the U.S.S.R.

Polevoi, Boris Nikolayevich, Writer; Chairman of the Board, Soviet Peace Fund.

Mostovets, Nikolai Vladimirovich, Research worker; Candidate of Sciences (History).

Kotov, Mikhail Ivanovich, Journalist; Executive Secretary, Soviet Peace Committee.

Kolesnikov, Georgii Arkadyevich, Director, Institute of Hydrophysical Studies, Academy of Sciences of the Ukrainian S.S.R.

Rybak, Natan Samoilovich, Writer, State Prize Winner.

Koretsky, Vladimir Mikhailovich, Director, Institute of Law; former Member of the International Court of Justce.

Zhurkin, Vitalii Vladimirovich, Deupty Director, Institute of the United States of the Academy of Sciences of the U.S.S.R.

Belyaev, Igor Petrovich, Deputy Director, Institute of Africa of the Academy of Sciences of the U.S.S.R.

Primakov, Evgenii Maksimovich, Doctor of Sciences (History); Deputy Director, Institute of World Economics and International Relations, Academy of Sciences of the U.S.S.R.

Ter-Grigoryan, Grigor Aramovich, Writer; Editor-in-Chief, VOZNY magazine; President of the Armenian Peace Committee.

Petrovsky, Vladimir Fyodorovich, Candidate of Sciences (Law); Senior Research Worker, Institute of the United States of the Academy of Sciences of the U.S.S.R.

Morozov, Grigorii Isosifovich, Chief, Section of International Organizations Institute of World Economics and International Relations.

Bobrakov, Yurii Ivanovich, Candidate of Sciences (Economics); Chief of the Section, Institute of the United States.

Zakhmatov, Mikhail Ivanovich, Candidate of Sciences (Economics); Chief of the section, Institute of the United States.

Masterkov, Lem Alexandrovich, Expert on Disarmament. Institute of World Economics and International Relations.

UNITED STATES PARTICIPANTS

General James M. Gavin, Chairman; Chairman of the Board, Arthur D. Little, Inc., Cambridge, Massachusetts; Lieutenant General, U.S. Army, Ret'd; United States Ambassador to France, 1961–62.

Dr. Harrison S. Brown, Foreign Secretary, National Academy of Sciences, Washington, D.C.; Professor of Geochemistry and of Science and Government, California Institute of Technology, Pasadena, California.

Mr. Robert G. Chollar, President, Charles F. Kettering Foundation; Vice President, Research, Development and Manufacturing, National Cash Register Company, 1964–1970.

Senator Frank Church, United States Senate (Democrat, Idaho) 1957–; Chairman, Foreign Relations Subcommittee on Western Hemisphere Affairs; Chairman, Interior Subcommittee on Public Lands; Member, United States Delegation to the United Nations General Assembly, 1966; Chairman, Special Committee on Aging.

Dr. Milton S. Eisenhower, President, The John Hopkins University, Baltimore, Md.; Chairman, President's Commission on the Causes and Prevention of Violence, 1968; Chairman, U.S. National Commission for UNESCO, 1946–48.

Mr. Lloyd N. Hand, Business Consultant, Beverly Hills, California; United States Chief of Protocol, 1965–66; President, Worldwide Consultants, Inc., 1966–

Ambassador Patricia R. Harris, Attorney, Washington, D.C.; Dean, School of Law, Howard University, 1969; United States Ambassador to Luxembourg, 1965–67.

Senator Mark O. Hatfield, United States Senate (Republican, Oregon) 1967–; Governor, State of Oregon, 1959–1967; Dean of Students, Associate Professor of Political Science, Willamette University, 1950–56.

Dr. George B. Kistiakowsky, Professor of Chemistry, Harvard University, Cambridge, Mass.; Special Assistant to the President of the United States for Science and Technology, 1959–1961.

Mr. Richard D. Lombard, Member of firm of Lombard, Vitalis, Paganucci & Nelson, Inc., New York; Board of Director, Charles F. Kettering Foundation.

Dr. Thomas F. Malone, Dean, The Graduate School, University of Connecticut, Storrs, Conn.; Chairman, Geophysics Research Board, National Academy of Sciences, 1969–; Chairman, U.S. National Commission for UNESCO, 1965–67.

Dr. Samuel Pisar, Attorney, Paris, France, and Washington, D.C.; Author.

Dr. Walter Orr Roberts, President, University Corporation for Atmospheric Research, Boulder, Colorado; Professor of Solar Astronomy, University of Colorado.

Dr. David Rockefeller, Chairman, The Chase Manhattan Bank, New York City; Vice President, Council on Foreign Relations.

Ambassador Charles W. Yost, Lecturer, Graduate School of International Affairs, Columbia University, New York; United States Representative to the United Nations, 1968–71; Senior Fellow, Council on Foreign Relations, 1966–68.

STAFF ASSISTANTS

Dr. James M. Read, Consultant to the U.S. Delegation; Consultant, The Charles F. Kettering Foundation, Dayton, Ohio; President, Wilmington College, Wilmington, Ohio, 1960–69; Deputy U.N. High Commissioner for Refugees, 1951–60.

Dr. C. Grant Pendill, Jr., Rapporteur, Associate Professor, Political Science, Western Illinois University, Macomb, Illinois; Director, Citizen Exchange Corps Field Institute, 1965–.

Mr. George Sherry, Interpreter, Principal Officer, Offices of the Under Secretaries-General for Special Political Affairs, United Nations.

Dr. George Klebnikov, Interpreter, Senior Member, U.N. Interpretation Services, United Nations.

Miss Estelle Linzer, Coordinator for U.S. Delegation, Consultant to The Johnson Foundation (Racine, Wisc.), in New York City.

○