

Ronald Reagan Presidential Library
Digital Library Collections

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

Collection: Hooley, James L.: Files
Folder Title: [1987 Reagan – Gorbachev Summit –
Reagan Speeches re: Zero Option Proposal] [1 of 2]
Box: 19374

To see more digitized collections visit:
<https://reaganlibrary.gov/archives/digital-library>

To see all Ronald Reagan Presidential Library
inventories visit:
<https://reaganlibrary.gov/document-collection>

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

Citation Guidelines: <https://reaganlibrary.gov/citing>

THE WHITE HOUSE

WASHINGTON

November 2, 1987

MEMORANDUM FOR JAMES L. HOOLEY

FROM: MARYLOU P. SKIDMORE *Marylou*

SUBJECT: THE ZERO OPTION PROPOSAL TO THE SOVIETS:
INITIAL SPEECH VENUES

In a Presidential News Conference on November 11, 1982, President Reagan referred to the matter of the INF (Intermediate-range Nuclear Force), the zero option that I announced a year ago. He was referring specifically to remarks that he made to members of the National Press Club on Arms Reduction and Nuclear Weapons on November 18, 1981 at the National Press Club Building. At that time the U.S. was prepared to cancel its deployment of Pershing II and ground-launch cruise missiles if the Soviets would dismantle their SS-20, SS-4, and SS-5 missiles. Not until June 8, 1982 in an Address to Members of Parliament did President Reagan refer to this proposal as the "zero-option initiative."

Thus, it was the President's hope that agreement by the Soviets to his initial proposal would result in obviating the need for the U.S. to deploy the Pershing II and ground-launch cruise missiles at all. Since the Soviets never agreed to dismantle, we countered by deploying the same kind of missiles aimed at their country.

In the next six months prior to his European tour, the President traveled to the following cities and spoke on the nuclear arms reduction proposal; *at least three times he spoke specifically on the desire for "zero on both sides:"

Bloomington, Minnesota	February 8, 1982
Des Moines, Iowa	February 9, 1982
*Oklahoma City, Oklahoma	March 16, 1982 "eliminate entirely the intermediate-range missiles"
*Eureka College, Illinois	May 9, 1982 "complete elimination of the most threatening systems on both sides"
*Chicago, Illinois	May 10, 1982 "commitment to the total elimination of those weapons"

In Departure Remarks given on June 2, 1982 to Administration Officials and White House Staff before leaving for Europe, the President spoke again of November when "we took up the issue and proposed to the Soviet Union negotiations leading toward a zero

11/2/87 5:00 p.m.

level, the elimination of intermediate-range weapons, their SS-20's and -4's and -5's in Europe, and the deploying of our Pershings and cruise missiles as a deterrent to those forces - a total elimination of those forces-..."

In Bonn, on June 9, 1982 the President referred to November 18th as the time when "I outlined a broad and ambitious arms control program. One element calls for reducing land-based intermediate-range nuclear missiles to zero on each side. If carried out, it would...make unnecessary the NATO decision to deploy American intermediate-range systems."

In Berlin, on June 11, 1982 the President renewed his November 18th proposal again. The President continued to push for the proposal throughout the rest of the year.

Further, research will be conducted if requested.

See Attachments for copies of speeches/remarks referred to above in chronological order.

11/2/87 5:00 p.m.

would lead to the necessary cooperation. The step taken was yet a modest one, but it brought out the political will of the 22 attending chiefs of state and government to pursue global negotiations within the framework of the United Nations.

Upon your return from Mexico you said that the efforts and constructive spirit which characterized the discussions at Cancún must continue. And the American Ambassador to the United Nations declared recently that every one of us bears the responsibility for transplanting the spirit of Cancún to all the forums of the United Nations system. This time we cannot fail. These words bring optimism to the developing world, which trusts the understanding and the good disposition of the United States.

Mr. President, Venezuela projects democracy and freedom in its foreign policy and has made its energetic wealth act as a concrete instrument of negotiation, cooperation, and international solidarity. A great many coincidences with the United States enable us to march side by side on the road of human freedom.

In your two speeches today, Mr. President, you referred first to Venezuelans such as Simón Bolívar, and in your speech tonight to young compatriots of mine who are in this world of sports, who, at a time not too far away nor too near this day, were people that were of interest to you and me when we were sports journalists.

You have called our compatriots, David Concepcion and Tony Armas, who today are excellent players in the big leagues. And if you allow me this association of ideas, perhaps you might have believed in

the talks I had today with you and with high representatives of your government that my position as was stated on Central America and the Caribbean is too optimistic. But I am an optimist, and I believe you are one, too.

When you were a candidate for the Presidency, on our television we saw many of the films in which you acted years ago, and I remember one very specially which is related to baseball.

You were playing the role of a pitcher, a great pitcher, who suddenly felt, let's say, a drop in his physical conditions, and it was the trust of his friends and his moral conviction that he had to play to have his team win that made the team win.

And I am sure that your quarry of optimism has not run dry. And although perhaps the situation might seem sometimes dramatic, we can be certain that it is people—men and people like those of the United States and Venezuela who love freedom—those are the ones that will win.

To reiterate, allow me to reiterate my gratitude and that of Betty and the persons who accompany me for all your kindness, and as I do so, I raise my glass in a toast to your personal happiness, that of your distinguished wife, to the democratic success of your government, and the prosperity and happiness of the people of the United States, a people forever committed to liberty.

Note: President Reagan spoke at 9:44 p.m. in the State Dining Room at the White House. President Herrera spoke in Spanish, and his remarks were translated by an interpreter.

Remarks to Members of the National Press Club on Arms Reduction and Nuclear Weapons

November 18, 1981

Officers, ladies and gentlemen of the National Press Club and, as of a very short time ago, fellow members:

Back in April while in the hospital I had, as you can readily understand, a lot of time

for reflection. And one day I decided to send a personal, handwritten letter to Soviet President Leonid Brezhnev reminding him that we had met about 10 years ago in San Clemente, California, as he and

you and with
ar government
ted on Central
is too optimis-
d I believe you

te for the Presi-
e saw many of
l years ago, and
illy which is re-

of a pitcher, a
felt, let's say, a
ons, and it was
is moral convic-
have his team

quarry of opti-
d although perse-
eem sometimes
tain that it is
ke those of the
a who love free-
it will win.

to reiterate my
and the persons
l your kindness,
lass in a toast to
at of your distin-
cratic success of
prosperity and
of the United
committed to

oke at 9:44 p.m.
n at the White
oke in Spanish,
lated by an in-

s Reduction

ay I decided to
ritten letter to
rezhnev remind-
out 10 years ago
nia, as he and

President Nixon were concluding a series of meetings that had brought hope to all the world. Never had peace and good will seemed closer at hand.

I'd like to read you a few paragraphs from that letter. "Mr. President: When we met, I asked if you were aware that the hopes and aspirations of millions of people throughout the world were dependent on the decisions that would be reached in those meetings. You took my hand in both of yours and assured me that you were aware of that and that you were dedicated with all your heart and soul and mind to fulfilling those hopes and dreams."

I went on in my letter to say: "The people of the world still share that hope. Indeed, the peoples of the world, despite differences in racial and ethnic origin, have very much in common. They want the dignity of having some control over their individual lives, their destiny. They want to work at the craft or trade of their own choosing and to be fairly rewarded. They want to raise their families in peace without harming anyone or suffering harm themselves. Government exists for their convenience, not the other way around.

"If they are incapable, as some would have us believe, of self-government, then where among them do we find any who are capable of governing others?"

"Is it possible that we have permitted ideology, political and economic philosophies, and governmental policies to keep us from considering the very real, everyday problems of our peoples? Will the average Soviet family be better off or even aware that the Soviet Union has imposed a government of its own choice on the people of Afghanistan? Is life better for the people of Cuba because the Cuban military dictate who shall govern the people of Angola?"

"It is often implied that such things have been made necessary because of territorial ambitions of the United States; that we have imperialistic designs, and thus constitute a threat to your own security and that of the newly emerging nations. Not only is there no evidence to support such a charge, there is solid evidence that the United States, when it could have dominated the world with no risk to itself, made no effort whatsoever to do so.

"When World War II ended, the United States had the only undamaged industrial power in the world. Our military might was at its peak, and we alone had the ultimate weapon, the nuclear weapon, with the unquestioned ability to deliver it anywhere in the world. If we had sought world domination then, who could have opposed us?"

"But the United States followed a different course, one unique in all the history of mankind. We used our power and wealth to rebuild the war-ravished economies of the world, including those of the nations who had been our enemies. May I say, there is absolutely no substance to charges that the United States is guilty of imperialism or attempts to impose its will on other countries, by use of force."

I continued my letter by saying—or concluded my letter, I should say—by saying, "Mr. President, should we not be concerned with eliminating the obstacles which prevent our people, those you and I represent, from achieving their most cherished goals?"

Well, it's in the same spirit that I want to speak today to this audience and the people of the world about America's program for peace and the coming negotiations which begin November 30th in Geneva, Switzerland. Specifically, **I want to present our program for preserving peace in Europe and our wider program for arms control.**

Twice in my lifetime, I have seen the peoples of Europe plunged into the tragedy of war. Twice in my lifetime, Europe has suffered destruction and military occupation in wars that statesmen proved powerless to prevent, soldiers unable to contain, and ordinary citizens unable to escape. And twice in my lifetime, young Americans have bled their lives into the soil of those battlefields not to enrich or enlarge our domain, but to restore the peace and independence of our friends and Allies.

All of us who lived through those troubled times share a common resolve that they must never come again. And most of us share a common appreciation of the Atlantic Alliance that has made a peaceful, free, and prosperous Western Europe in the post-war era possible.

But today, a new generation is emerging on both sides of the Atlantic. Its members were not present at the creation of the North Atlantic Alliance. Many of them don't fully understand its roots in defending freedom and rebuilding a war-torn continent. Some young people question why we need weapons, particularly nuclear weapons, to deter war and to assure peaceful development. They fear that the accumulation of weapons itself may lead to conflagration. Some even propose unilateral disarmament.

I understand their concerns. Their questions deserve to be answered. But we have an obligation to answer their questions on the basis of judgment and reason and experience. Our policies have resulted in the longest European peace in this century. Wouldn't a rash departure from these policies, as some now suggest, endanger that peace?

From its founding, the Atlantic Alliance has preserved the peace through unity, deterrence, and dialog. First, we and our Allies have stood united by the firm commitment that an attack upon any one of us would be considered an attack upon us all. Second, we and our Allies have deterred aggression by maintaining forces strong enough to ensure that any aggressor would lose more from an attack than he could possibly gain. And third, we and our Allies have engaged the Soviets in a dialog about mutual restraint and arms limitations, hoping to reduce the risk of war and the burden of armaments and to lower the barriers that divide East from West.

These three elements of our policy have preserved the peace in Europe for more than a third of a century. They can preserve it for generations to come, so long as we pursue them with sufficient will and vigor.

Today, I wish to reaffirm America's commitment to the Atlantic Alliance and our resolve to sustain the peace. And from my conversations with allied leaders, I know that they also remain true to this tried and proven course.

NATO's policy of peace is based on restraint and balance. No NATO weapons, conventional or nuclear, will ever be used in Europe except in response to attack. NATO's defense plans have been responsi-

ble and restrained. The Allies remain strong, united, and resolute. But the momentum of the continuing Soviet military buildup threatens both the conventional and the nuclear balance.

Consider the facts. Over the past decade, the United States reduced the size of its Armed Forces and decreased its military spending. The Soviets steadily increased the number of men under arms. They now number more than double those of the United States. Over the same period, the Soviets expanded their real military spending by about one-third. The Soviet Union increased its inventory of tanks to some 50,000, compared to our 11,000. Historically a land power, they transformed their navy from a coastal defense force to an open ocean fleet, while the United States, a sea power with transoceanic alliances, cut its fleet in half.

During a period when NATO deployed no new intermediate-range nuclear missiles and actually withdrew 1,000 nuclear warheads, the Soviet Union deployed more than 750 nuclear warheads on the new SS-20 missiles alone.

Our response to this relentless buildup of Soviet military power has been restrained but firm. We have made decisions to strengthen all three legs of the strategic triad: sea-, land-, and air-based. We have proposed a defense program in the United States for the next 5 years which will remedy the neglect of the past decade and restore the eroding balance on which our security depends.

I would like to discuss more specifically the growing threat to Western Europe which is posed by the continuing deployment of certain Soviet intermediate-range nuclear missiles. The Soviet Union has three different type such missile systems: the SS-20, the SS-4, and the SS-5, all with the range capable of reaching virtually all of Western Europe. There are other Soviet weapon systems which also represent a major threat.

Now, the only answer to these systems is a comparable threat to Soviet threats, to Soviet targets; in other words, a deterrent preventing the use of these Soviet weapons by the counterthreat of a like response

Allies remain
e. But the mo-
Soviet military
ie conventional

the past decade,
the size of its
used its military
ily increased the
rms. They now
e those of the
ime period, the
military spend-
ie Soviet Union
tanks link to
000. Historically
med their navy
rce to an open
ed States, a sea
aliances, cut its

NATO deployed
nuclear missiles
00 nuclear war-
deployed more
on the new SS-

ntless buildup of
been restrained
le decisions to
of the strategic
ased. We have
n in the United
ars which will
past decade and
e on which our

more specifically
Western Europe
ntinuing deploy-
ermediate-range
Union has three
systems: the SS-
-5, all with the
virtually all of
re other Soviet
so represent a

these systems is
oviet threats, to
rds, a deterrent
Soviet weapons
a like response

against their own territory. At present, however, there is no equivalent deterrent to these Soviet intermediate missiles. And the Soviets continue to add one new SS-20 a week.

To counter this, the Allies agreed in 1979, as part of a two-track decision, to deploy as a deterrent land-based cruise missiles and Pershing II missiles capable of reaching targets in the Soviet Union. These missiles are to be deployed in several countries of Western Europe. This relatively limited force in no way serves as a substitute for the much larger strategic umbrella spread over our NATO Allies. Rather, it provides a vital link between conventional shorter-range nuclear forces in Europe and intercontinental forces in the United States.

Deployment of these systems will demonstrate to the Soviet Union that this link cannot be broken. Detering war depends on the perceived ability of our forces to perform effectively. The more effective our forces are, the less likely it is that we'll have to use them. So, we and our allies are proceeding to modernize NATO's nuclear forces of intermediate range to meet increased Soviet deployments of nuclear systems threatening Western Europe.

Let me turn now to our hopes for arms control negotiations. There's a tendency to make this entire subject overly complex. I want to be clear and concise. I told you of the letter I wrote to President Brezhnev last April. Well, I've just sent another message to the Soviet leadership. It's a simple, straightforward, yet, historic message. The United States proposes the mutual reduction of conventional intermediate-range nuclear and strategic forces. Specifically, I have proposed a four-point agenda to achieve this objective in my letter to President Brezhnev.

The first and most important point concerns the Geneva negotiations. As part of the 1979 two-track decision, NATO made a commitment to seek arms control negotiations with the Soviet Union on intermediate range nuclear forces. The United States has been preparing for these negotiations through close consultation with our NATO partners.

We're now ready to set forth our proposal. I have informed President Brezhnev that

when our delegation travels to the negotiations on intermediate range, land-based nuclear missiles in Geneva on the 30th of this month, my representatives will present the following proposal: The United States is prepared to cancel its deployment of Pershing II and ground-launch cruise missiles if the Soviets will dismantle their SS-20, SS-4, and SS-5 missiles. This would be an historic step. With Soviet agreement, we could together substantially reduce the dread threat of nuclear war which hangs over the people of Europe. This, like the first footstep on the Moon, would be a giant step for mankind.

Now, we intend to negotiate in good faith and go to Geneva willing to listen to and consider the proposals of our Soviet counterparts, but let me call to your attention the background against which our proposal is made.

During the past 6 years while the United States deployed no new intermediate-range missiles and withdrew 1,000 nuclear warheads from Europe, the Soviet Union deployed 750 warheads on mobile, accurate ballistic missiles. They now have 1,100 warheads on the SS-20s, SS-4s and 5s. And the United States has no comparable missiles. Indeed, the United States dismantled the last such missile in Europe over 15 years ago.

As we look to the future of the negotiations, it's also important to address certain Soviet claims, which left unrefuted could become critical barriers to real progress in arms control.

The Soviets assert that a balance of intermediate range nuclear forces already exists. That assertion is wrong. By any objective measure, as this chart indicates, the Soviet Union has developed an increasingly overwhelming advantage. They now enjoy a superiority on the order of six to one. The red is the Soviet buildup; the blue is our own. That is 1975, and that is 1981.

Now, Soviet spokesmen have suggested that moving their SS-20s behind the Ural Mountains will remove the threat to Europe. Well, as this map demonstrates, the SS-20s, even if deployed behind the Urals, will have a range that puts almost all of Western Europe—the great cities—Rome,

Athens, Paris, London, Brussels, Amsterdam, Berlin, and so many more—all of Scandinavia, all of the Middle East, all of northern Africa, all within range of these missiles which, incidentally, are mobile and can be moved on shorter notice. These little images mark the present location which would give them a range clear out into the Atlantic.

The second proposal that I've made to President Brezhnev concerns strategic weapons. The United States proposes to open negotiations on strategic arms as soon as possible next year.

I have instructed Secretary Haig to discuss the timing of such meetings with Soviet representatives. Substance, however, is far more important than timing. As our proposal for the Geneva talks this month illustrates, we can make proposals for genuinely serious reductions, but only if we take the time to prepare carefully.

The United States has been preparing carefully for resumption of strategic arms negotiations because we don't want a repetition of past disappointments. We don't want an arms control process that sends hopes soaring only to end in dashed expectations.

Now, I have informed President Brezhnev that we will seek to negotiate substantial reductions in nuclear arms which would result in levels that are equal and verifiable. Our approach to verification will be to emphasize openness and creativity, rather than the secrecy and suspicion which have undermined confidence in arms control in the past.

While we can hope to benefit from work done over the past decade in strategic arms negotiations, let us agree to do more than simply begin where these previous efforts left off. We can and should attempt major qualitative and quantitative progress. Only such progress can fulfill the hopes of our own people and the rest of the world. And let us see how far we can go in achieving truly substantial reductions in our strategic arsenals.

To symbolize this fundamental change in direction, we will call these negotiations **START—Strategic Arms Reduction Talks**.

The third proposal I've made to the Soviet Union is that we act to achieve

equality at lower levels of conventional forces in Europe. The defense needs of the Soviet Union hardly call for maintaining more combat divisions in East Germany today than were in the whole Allied invasion force that landed in Normandy on D-Day. The Soviet Union could make no more convincing contribution to peace in Europe, and in the world, than by agreeing to reduce its conventional forces significantly and constrain the potential for sudden aggression.

Finally, I have pointed out to President Brezhnev that to maintain peace we must reduce the risks of surprise attack and the chance of war arising out of uncertainty or miscalculation.

I am renewing our proposal for a conference to develop effective measures that would reduce these dangers. At the current Madrid meeting of the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe, we're laying the foundation for a Western-proposed conference on disarmament in Europe. This conference would discuss new measures to enhance stability and security in Europe. Agreement in this conference is within reach. I urge the Soviet Union to join us and many other nations who are ready to launch this important enterprise.

All of these proposals are based on the same fair-minded principles—substantial, militarily significant reduction in forces, equal ceilings for similar types of forces, and adequate provisions for verification.

My administration, our country, and I are committed to achieving arms reductions agreements based on these principles. Today I have outlined the kinds of bold, equitable proposals which the world expects of us. But we cannot reduce arms unilaterally. Success can only come if the Soviet Union will share our commitment, if it will demonstrate that its often-repeated professions of concern for peace will be matched by positive action.

Preservation of peace in Europe and the pursuit of arms reduction talks are of fundamental importance. But we must also help to bring peace and security to regions now torn by conflict, external intervention, and war.

of conventional
se needs of the
for maintaining
East Germany
role Allied inva-
ormandy on D-
d make no more
peace in Europe,
by agreeing to
ces significantly
l for sudden ag-

out to President
peace we must
e attack and the
of uncertainty or

osal for a confer-
e measures that
s. At the current
ference on Secu-

Europe, we're
a Western-pro-
disarmament in
ould discuss new
ility and security
this conference is

Soviet Union to
nations who are
ortant enterprise.
re based on the
iples—substantial,
action in forces,
types of forces,
r verification.

country, and I are
arms reductions
these principles.
e kinds of bold,
he world expects
ce arms unilater-
ne if the Soviet
mitment, if it will
repeated profes-
will be matched

n Europe and the
talks are of funda-
ve must also help
ity to regions now
intervention, and

The American concept of peace goes well beyond the absence of war. We foresee a flowering of economic growth and individual liberty in a world at peace.

At the economic summit conference in Cancún, I met with the leaders of 21 nations and sketched out our approach to global economic growth. We want to eliminate the barriers to trade and investment which hinder these critical incentives to growth, and we're working to develop new programs to help the poorest nations achieve self-sustaining growth.

And terms like "peace" and "security", we have to say, have little meaning for the oppressed and the destitute. They also mean little to the individual whose state has stripped him of human freedom and dignity. Wherever there is oppression, we must strive for the peace and security of individuals as well as states. We must recognize that progress and the pursuit of liberty is a necessary complement to military security. Nowhere has this fundamental truth been more boldly and clearly stated than in the Helsinki Accords of 1975. These accords have not yet been translated into living reality.

Today I've announced an agenda that can help to achieve peace, security, and freedom across the globe. In particular, I have

made an important offer to forego entirely deployment of new American missiles in Europe if the Soviet Union is prepared to respond on an equal footing.

There is no reason why people in any part of the world should have to live in permanent fear of war or its spectre. I believe the time has come for all nations to act in a responsible spirit that doesn't threaten other states. I believe the time is right to move forward on arms control and the resolution of critical regional disputes at the conference table. Nothing will have a higher priority for me and for the American people over the coming months and years.

Addressing the United Nations 20 years ago, another American President described the goal that we still pursue today. He said, "If we all can persevere, if we can look beyond our shores and ambitions, then surely the age will dawn in which the strong are just and the weak secure and the peace preserved."

He didn't live to see that goal achieved. I invite all nations to join with America today in the quest for such a world.

Thank you.

Note: The President spoke at 10 a.m. at the National Press Club Building. His address was broadcast live on radio and television.

Remarks of President Reagan and President Luis Herrera Campíns of Venezuela Following Their Meetings

November 18, 1981

President Reagan. President Herrera and I have just concluded a series of productive meetings in which we reviewed the relations between our two countries and the international situation.

The overall relations between the United States and Venezuela are excellent, and we've discovered that both nations share similar concerns about the international situation. We took a close look at development in the Caribbean Basin Region and discussed what can be done to promote peace, freedom, and representative government in that part of the world.

We agreed to pursue the initiative begun by Venezuela, Mexico, Canada, and the United States for the Caribbean Basin Region. We will continue, and strengthen where possible, our individual assistance programs and encourage other states to do likewise. And furthermore, we agreed that we must promote the economic and social development of the hemisphere through international cooperation. We can be expected to continue our opposition to any interference in the internal affairs of Western Hemisphere countries.

This last year in the United States was a time of rededication to fundamental American economic and political concepts, as mandated by the people in the elections of 1980. After a period of increase in government power, the American people decided that the time had come to move away from state control and regulation; move toward something more consistent with our belief in freedom and individual liberty.

The United States in these last 12 months has been blessed with peace, and peace remains our goal. Our military strength is dedicated to this noble end.

Consistent with this, on November 18th and on behalf of the American people, I proposed to the Soviet Union a removal of the nuclear weapons threatening Europe. Negotiations between our two nations will continue this effort in the months ahead. The United States has offered a plan to eliminate all land-based, intermediate-range nuclear missiles on the European continent. We're urging the Soviet Union to join us in reaching that goal.

We take no joy in using our resources to produce weapons of war. During the last 10 years, the United States reduced the size of its Armed Forces and decreased its military spending. Sadly, this gesture was met by a massive buildup of Soviet armed forces. Let us hope the current opportunity for arms reduction is not lost. The Soviet Union should realize that its resources might better be spent on meeting the needs of its people, rather than producing instruments of destruction.

In 1981 senseless violence continued to plague the world. A great man in Egypt, a man of peace, was murdered. An attempt was made on the life of Pope John Paul, almost robbing the world of this sincere man of God. I, too, had occasion to realize that we must use what time we have to further those values which will last after we as individuals are gone.

A former President of the United States once said: "The chief ideal of the American people is idealism . . . America is a nation of idealists." Well, that's as true today as when President Calvin Coolidge spoke those words back in 1925.

Americans remain dedicated to those concepts of liberty that have provided our people with freedom and abundance. Furthermore, we're a nation composed of people who have come here from every corner of the world, people of all races and creeds who have learned to live together in peace and prosperity. Perhaps you know someone or have relatives who now live here. Well, they're every bit as American as those who came here two centuries ago seeking freedom. In a very real sense all people who long for freedom are our fellow countrymen. That love of freedom is what brought us or our ancestors to this land.

Because of this special American character, our hearts go out to those who suffer oppression. Last year we saw the workers of Poland struggle to edge their country closer to freedom—and instead, they were given bloodshed and oppression. We saw the courageous people of Afghanistan battle against tremendous odds trying to cast off foreign domination.

During my lifetime, I have seen the rise of fascism and communism. Both philosophies glorify the arbitrary power of the state. These ideologies held, at first, a certain fascination for some intellectuals. But both theories fail. Both deny those God-given liberties that are the inalienable right of each person on this planet; indeed they deny the existence of God. Because of this fundamental flaw, fascism has already been destroyed, and the bankruptcy of communism has been laid bare for all to see—a system that is efficient in producing machines of war but cannot feed its people.

Americans begin this new year with a renewed commitment to our ideals and with confidence that the peace will be maintained and that freedom for all men will ultimately prevail. So, wherever you are, America sends to you a New Year's wish of good will. To all who yearn to breathe free, who long for a better life, we think of you; we pray for you; we're with you always.

Note: The President's remarks were filmed for broadcast on television by the United States International Communication Agency.

responsible for the development, and implementation of policy, as approved by addition, he will be leading staff support and for National Security Council. The President for National Security. Mr. Clark will have a relationship to the President.

role for the Assistant to the National Security Affairs, will implement recommendations to the President by the President, Edwin Meese review of the national

Executive Director

manager, China Sea Area, in vice president and area Asia Area, in 1974-75; and president and international Australia, in 1970-74. from Colgate University Stanford University Graduate (M.B.A., 1969). He is children, and resides in Baltimore, Md.

the National

of CIO, an international of some 150,000 members. 11 years, he has guided the International Brotherhood. spent most of his working for movement, beginning in a boilermaker apprenticeship

on the Wabash Railroad. He served as a member of the 100th Infantry Division, Seventh Army, during

World War II. He is married and resides in Kansas City, Kans. He was born July 30, 1921, in Kansas City.

Remarks of the President and Chancellor Helmut Schmidt of the Federal Republic of Germany Following Their Meetings January 5, 1982

The President. Chancellor Schmidt and I have just concluded another of our meetings at a critical moment in world affairs. The primary topic on our minds, of course, was Poland and the imposition of martial law in that unhappy land.

We thoroughly discussed the extent of Soviet involvement in the repression being waged against the Polish people and the need for forceful Western measures to induce both the Polish and Soviet authorities to lift martial law, release all those who have been detained, and permit resumption of a national dialog leading to genuine reform.

In that connection, I reviewed with the Chancellor the series of steps that I had announced in my Christmas message and on December 29th. I emphasized my belief that a tangible Alliance response to the Polish crisis must be made now. Should we fail to insist that the Soviet Union stop pressuring Poland directly and indirectly, the gravest consequences for international relations could ensue.

Our conversations today covered a wide range of related political, security, and economic issues. For example, we discussed the importance of the negotiations on intermediate nuclear forces in Geneva which began on November 30th and our hope that the Soviet Union will avoid sterile propaganda and respond constructively to our zero-level proposal for genuine reduction of nuclear arms.

Other international issues on our agenda included the prospects for strategic arms reduction talks—what we call START; the situation in Central America, in the Middle East, and in southern Africa; and the status of the CSCE [Commission on Security and Cooperation in Europe] process, particular-

ly in light of the Polish crisis.

We also reiterated the concern we both feel over the continued Soviet occupation of Afghanistan and our support for initiatives by the European Parliament and the United States Congress to establish March 21st as Afghanistan Day.

For its part, the United States, through the U.S. International Communication Agency, is today releasing for overseas distribution a book which eloquently documents the human face of the Afghan struggle against Soviet invasion forces. I have personally presented a copy to Chancellor Schmidt.

Above all, we agreed on the importance of the U.S.-German partnership and the need for continued close consultations. We hope to broaden and deepen these contacts. We also make clear to public opinion in both countries, especially the younger generation, the responsibility that we all share of maintaining both our friendship and our commitment to the one instrument which has kept peace for over 30 years—the North Atlantic Alliance.

Chancellor Schmidt, welcome.

The Chancellor. Thank you, Mr. President. Ladies and gentlemen, I can fully subscribe to what your President just told you about the contents and the results of our discussions. There are three points which I would like to stress.

Number one, as regards the sad events in Poland, I had a chance to relay to the President the results of the meeting of 10 foreign secretaries of the 10 European member countries of the European Community who met in Brussels yesterday morning on that question. And the President was satisfied with that. He welcomed that statement. It includes the three points

hours a week for an entire year. And, as the details in the budget illustrate, many of these savings come from reducing tax and regulatory forms that are unusually burdensome to small businesses.

These paperwork reductions are a good start, but they're only a start. The budget that we're releasing this morning still does not document all of the Federal paperwork that must be identified and reduced. And, as you will see in a moment, many of the issues that are being designated for revision by my Task Force on Regulatory Relief are based upon complaints from small compa-

nies about unnecessary paperwork.

So, now I'm going to turn over the proceedings to Vice President Bush to discuss these issues with you. And thank you very much.

Note: The President spoke at 11:26 a.m. in Room 450 of the Old Executive Office Building.

The 66-page document mentioned in the President's remarks is entitled "Information Collection Budget of the United States Government—Fiscal Year 1982."

Statement About the Intermediate-Range Nuclear Force Negotiations

February 4, 1982

On November 18, I announced a broad program for peace. In that address, I stated that the delegation that was about to depart for Geneva for negotiations with the Soviet Union on intermediate-range nuclear forces would carry with it the U.S. proposal, according to which the U.S. would forego the planned deployment of Pershing II and intermediate-range ground-launched cruise missiles if the Soviet Union dismantled its SS-4, SS-5, and SS-20 missiles.

On Tuesday, February 2, at Geneva, the United States submitted to the Soviet Union a draft treaty, embodying that proposal, in order to move the negotiations forward as rapidly as possible. Such a treaty would be a major contribution to security, stability, and peace.

I call on President Brezhnev to join us in this important first step to reduce the nuclear shadow that hangs over the peoples of the world.

Note: On the same day, the Office of the

Press Secretary released a statement by Assistant to the President for Communications David R. Gergen. The statement, which he read at the daily press briefing, was in response to the Soviet Union's proposal made at Geneva, Switzerland, that United States and Soviet intermediate-range nuclear missiles be reduced by two-thirds by 1990. The statement, which follows, also addressed charges made on February 3 by Soviet President L. I. Brezhnev that the United States was not seriously negotiating at Geneva.

We reject the accusation that the United States is stalling the INF negotiations, and we are familiar with this Soviet proposal for phased reductions from an alleged current balance. The Soviet "balance" is based on selective use of data and is not a meaningful basis for negotiations. We are negotiating in good faith and have made a serious and far-reaching proposal which we believe provides a sound basis for agreement.

miracle of Christ, 20 years ago that would have been reported—with Christ walking on water—the headlines would have read, "Miracle: Christ Walks on Water." But our friends today in the media and their business, that same event would be recorded, "Exposé: Christ Can't Swim." [Laughter]

You mentioned, Mr. President, that the Stanley Cup, which is awarded to these outstanding athletes who vie each year over a thousand games to have their name inscribed on what I believe is the world's oldest, and certainly the most respected professional trophy. We felt that the only way that we could come close to thanking you was to see that you got what these gentlemen worked so hard for, and that is a replica of our Stanley Cup.

For a minute, if I may read the inscription: "Presented with respect and appreciation to President Ronald Reagan by the Governors, players, and officials of the National Hockey League on the occasion of

the 34th National Hockey League All-Star Game, Washington, D.C., February 8th, 1982." Mr. President.

We had also heard of our President's activity as a hockey player. At that time he wore the jersey of the New York Americans. Mr. President, we were concerned that perhaps that jersey had worn out, and so we'd like to present you with an All-Star jersey that will be worn by our teams in this contest and appropriately—[displaying the jersey with the name "Reagan" and the number "1"]—

The President. Thank you all.

I had heard the Stanley Cup was going to be—I thought it was the real thing. [Laughter] And I was waiting anxiously to have it opened and displayed here. But both of these—I thank you very much, and I'm greatly honored and pleased to have them.

Note: The President spoke at 1:28 p.m. in the East Room at the White House.

Remarks at a Rally for United States Senator David Durenberger in Bloomington, Minnesota

February 8, 1982

Governor, Senator Durenberger, and Penny, our Congressmen who are here—Tom Hagedorn, Bill Frenzel, Vin Weber, and Arlan Stangeland—and an old friend who is right down here in front, known to all of us. Why don't you stand up here? I know they would all recognize you when you do. Harold Stassen. I thank all of you for that Paul Bunyan welcome.

I don't know, perhaps it's Paul Bunyan's influence that causes so many tall tales to be told in Minnesota. Dave Durenberger tried to tell me that it's been so cold that the walleyes jumped on the hooks just to get out of the water. [Laughter] Now, I didn't believe that. [Laughter] Then he tried to tell me it's been so cold that the Minnesota State bird is now a penguin. [Laughter] And I didn't believe that. And then he tried to tell me that it's been so cold here that the only place you can keep warm is at a Durenberger campaign rally.

And that I believe.

Dave, I was going to say something about you being a Paul Bunyan yourself, and then that connotation of maybe tall tales and everything, I don't want to take away anything from what you just previously said. [Laughter] I don't want to infer that it might not—anyway, I appreciate it.

But this Senator has spent at least 120 days each year traveling through this State. He spends an average of 2½ days a week in Minnesota and still maintains a voting record in the Senate of 95 percent. We've got some that have forgotten about going home. They now live in Washington, and they don't have a voting record like that. If every public official served his State and the nation as well as Dave Durenberger, we could lick our problems in no time.

He's been especially helpful in our effort to reduce taxes and spending. You perhaps got that idea hearing him a few moments

of the great industrial nations of our people because of this country's industrial malaise, because we're unable to compete with other nations, because we've had a rate of investment in new plant and equipment—the plant and equipment in our country is 20 years old. In Japan, it's only

18 months when the first slight program went into effect, and a definite increase in the rate of people's earnings that is needed to form the capital pool and business can turn and they need to expand and become once again competitive. We're outcompeted because our working man isn't as good as the best working people in the world. We haven't given them the tools to compete on the international

market. We can tell you that that deficit of 1983 will actually be a contribution to the gross national product. Deficits were in '75 to '78, coming out of that '74, '75 program, who opposed our plan and indeed, were saying it was dead before it even started, as I say, was last October. It was strangely quiet about the increases took place and in tax rates and there were 2 million unemployed. We didn't go to 2 million from full employment. We're pretty well on our way to a balanced budget.

Based on the idea that government spending, the rate of increase in government spending, must be reduced within the limit of the growth of our revenues that we

are making smaller assessments against each individual.

And the third phase of it is thousands of regulations that have been passed over the last few decades conflicting, competing regulations inflicted on local government, on State government, and on the private sector—unnecessary regulations, some you could laugh at, if they didn't hurt so much. Well, under the Vice President, we've had a task force working on those regulations. And already, as I said the other night in the State of the Union address, there are now 23,000 fewer pages in the *Federal Record* (*Federal Register*), which lists the Federal regulations, than there were when we started a year ago. And we're going to do more.

And we have a task force at work also on fraud and waste and extravagance in government. When people say that our programs, if we're reducing the amount of money, with the increase needed for some of the social programs, we're trying to get at the people who were never intended to participate in those programs in the first place, but who, through the conflicting Federal regulations and loopholes, legally or technically are participating, and there is no real need for them to be helped at the expense of their neighbors. This is what we're trying to do and to change.

To give you an example of how much out there is to be found and how much we're counting on in the coming year, our task force just with one foray—not a nationwide investigation of this as yet—has found that in one program, 8,500 recipients of benefits are still receiving those benefits, and they have been dead an average of 7 years. That's why the other part of our program, which you can call the fourth point I proposed the other night, which is the federalism program to get government in at least 40-odd programs back into the hands of local and State governments where it can be run properly by people closest to the scene and not mismanaged by the Federal

Government.

I've talked longer than I intended to, but I'm just going to say one more thing. A lot of the demagoguery you will hear will be about the fact of the defense budget, and if anything has to be cut, why don't we cut that? We don't cut it because that's what's been going on for the last several years, and it will take us until the middle of the 1980's before we can even begin to come close to equating what the Soviet Union has built up to threaten us with.

It is absolutely necessary that we restore that capacity to defend ourselves. And when I look at these young people down here—and I'm so happy to see them here and to participate—I just want to tell you one thing. When we build up our national defenses, it isn't with the idea that some day you're going to go fight a war. The idea in building them up is that we will be so strong that no other generation of young Americans will have to bleed their lives into foreign battlefields or beachheads someplace out in the oceans.

I promise you one more thing—that as we build up our national defense, our national security, we will not stop or let up one minute with getting those other fellows across the table from us and now talking legitimate arms reductions.

Well, that's all, except to tell you, you just confirm everything that Dave and I and the others there believe. You have to get about 50 miles, at least, away from the Potomac River and the District to get back to the real world.

God bless you. Thank you very much.

Note: The President spoke at 5:40 p.m. in the Celebrity Room at the Carleton Dinner Theater.

Prior to speaking at the rally, the President attended a Durenberger for Senate reception, which was also held at the dinner theater.

Address Before a Joint Session of the Iowa State Legislature in Des Moines

February 9, 1982

Governor Ray, I thank you very much. We've known each other a long time, and I appreciate more than I can say your warm words of welcome and your warm welcome here this morning.

It's good to be here with you today, but I must tell you that my real mission in Des Moines is at WHO radio. [Laughter] You see, some years back, as you may know, I recreated ball games on the air based on reports that came by telegraph. I would, now that I'm here, like to recreate the Rose Bowl game, and this time around you know who's going to win.

When I knew the Hawkeyes back in the thirties, they were struggling to get out of one of those low spots that come every once in a while to a school and a team. Coach Hayden Fry and quarterback Gordy Bohannon and the rest of that team rode the comeback trail all the way to the Rose Bowl.

Well, our country today is at a turning point. We've lived too long by the maxims of past decades, lost in a jungle of government bureaucracy, tangled in its web of programs and regulations. And almost all of those government initiatives were intended to relieve suffering, enforce justice, or preserve an environment threatened by pollution. But for each ounce of blessing, a pound of freedom was quietly stolen.

An all-intrusive Federal Government with Federal Government's big taxing and big spending doesn't work, never has worked, and never will. Those who cling to the policies of yesterday, who offer us only retreat, would condemn us and our children to decades more of economic decay—decades in which our days of greatness would be just a dim memory.

I've come here to talk about moving forward. It'll take spirit, courage, and strength for the long haul. But we must do it. I'm not here to promise miracles, but I believe we can promise progress.

So I have come to Des Moines to consult with you, to seek your counsel and your

support as, together, we take the high road to national recovery and renewal. We share the trust of elected office, you for your State and I for the country and the people who sent me. And I have come to cement again the bond of partnership too many have forgotten.

Together we must go forward to ensure a decent standard of living for all Americans, but we must also protect for the next generation this fragile state of freedom so rare in the world and in the history of man.

I think we've taken the right first steps. We've begun to rebuild America's defenses, which had been left in dangerous decline. We've made clear our commitment to peace and stability in the world and our willingness to participate in strategic arms reduction. But we also have made clear that we will not look the other way as aggressors usurp the rights of independent people or watch idly while they foment revolutions to impose the rule of tyrants. We will not turn our backs on those who seek to gain or secure their liberty, and we will not back down from our duty to keep America strong enough to remain both free and at peace.

At home, we've begun our campaign to return our economy and government to our people.

Our program for economic recovery and our proposal to restore the partnership between State, local, and Federal government are born from the same philosophy. They spring from an abiding faith in the American people and in our ability to govern ourselves.

Forty years of uncontrolled government growth and mismanagement, 40 years of removing the American economy from the hands of the American people, have resulted in the painful recession that grips us today. In 4 short months, our programs have begun to restore incentive, to cut away strangling regulations and, for the first time in decades, make significant gains against the budget monster.

Mar. 16 / Administration of Ronald Reagan, 1982

Address Before a Joint Session of the Oklahoma State Legislature in
Oklahoma City
March 16, 1982

I thank you for that genuine Oklahoma welcome. Governor Nigh, [Lieutenant] Governor Bernard, Speaker Draper, President York, the minority leaders, the distinguished members of the legislature, and honored guests:

Before I begin my planned remarks this morning, I would like to speak again to the question of controlling nuclear arms, a subject of deep concern to all Americans, to our allies, and to the people of the world. The hope of all men everywhere is peace—peace not only for this generation but for generations to come. To preserve peace, to ensure it for the future, we must not just freeze the production of nuclear arms, we must reduce the exorbitant level that already exists.

Those who are serious about peace, those who truly abhor the potential for nuclear destruction must begin an undertaking for real arms reduction. President Brezhnev has proposed a unilateral moratorium on further deployment of SS-20 missiles in Western Europe. Well, I say today, as I said yesterday, and as I made clear on November 18th, a freeze simply isn't good enough, because it doesn't go far enough. We must go beyond a freeze.

Let's consider some facts about the military balance in Europe. The Soviet Union now has 300 brand new SS-20 missiles with 900 warheads deployed. All can hit targets anywhere in Western Europe. NATO has zero land-based missiles which can hit the U.S.S.R.

When President Brezhnev offers to stop deployments in Western Europe, he fails to mention that these are mobile missiles. It doesn't matter where you put them, since you can move them anywhere you want, including back to Western Europe. And even if east of the Urals, they could still target most of Western Europe.

Our proposal, now on the table in Geneva, is that we not deploy any of the intermediate missiles in Europe, in exchange for Soviet agreement to dismantle

what they now have there. And that's fair. That is zero on both sides. And if President Brezhnev is serious about real arms control—and I hope he is—he will join in real arms reduction.

Now, I come to you today as an American who shares many of the values for which Oklahomans are known. No other State better exemplifies the American experience than does Oklahoma. People from all over the world came here to claim a bit of land—their part of America—and to make a new life. These people confronted the most undeveloped country known to man with optimism, self-pride, and rugged independence.

Edna Ferber's epic "Cimarron" captured this spirit when her hero proclaimed, "Here everything's fresh. It's all to do, and we can do it. There's never been a chance like it in the world. We can make an . . . empire out of this Oklahoma country. . . ." Well, this is the vitality that captured the imagination of the world; it's the fabric of which Oklahoma and America are made.

The people who settled here not only endured, they triumphed. Some who've never lived in this State often wonder why, with a population of only 3 million, you can produce such great football teams. [Laughter] Well, after overcoming tornadoes, floods, drought, and Oklahoma winters, totin' a ball down a field a hundred yards just isn't such a hard job, even if there are 11 guys in front of you trying to stop you. [Laughter]

Standing here today, it's easy to forget the pessimism—so uncharacteristic of America—that swept this country only a short while ago. Two decades of economic folly had brought our people to the edge of despair.

In the closing months of 1980, our once-proud economy was gasping for breath. Inflation had been running at double-digit levels for 2 consecutive years, with no relief in sight. At the same time, unemployment was near 8 million. The savings rate had plummeted to the lowest of any industrial

Nomination of 16 Members of the National Advisory Council on Women's Educational Programs March 31, 1982

The President today announced his intention to nominate the following individuals to be members of the National Advisory Council on Women's Educational Programs:

Mary Jo Arndt, 48, is president of the Illinois Federation of Republican Women. She resides in Lombard, Ill.

Marge Bodwell, 61, is a teacher at the North School in Alamogordo, N. Mex.

Betty Ann Gault Cordoba, 54, is a teacher in Woodland Hills, Calif.

Lilli K. Dollinger, 23, is director of communications, Student Government Association, Texas A&M University, College Station, Tex.

Gilda Bojorquez Gjurich, 55, is secretary-treasurer and partner, Robert Parada Construction Co., Alhambra, Calif.

Marcilyn D. Leier, 53, is involved in community and Republican Party activities in Roseville, Minn.

Judith D. Moss, 36, is administrative attorney with the firm of Barrett & Barrett, Columbus, Ohio.

Marie Sheehan Muhler, 44, is minority whip of the New Jersey General Assembly. She resides

in Marlboro, N.J.

Susan E. Phillips, 36, is director, research and publications, the Conservative Caucus, Vienna, Va.

Irene Renee Robinson, 59, is involved in community and Republican Party activities in Washington, D.C.

Judy F. Rolfe, 28, is vice president, Rolfe and Wood, Inc., Bozeman, Mont.

Eleanor Knee Rooks, 54, is a former teacher and is currently involved in community and Republican Party activities in Brownsville, Tenn.

Eunice S. Thomas, 52, is a teacher at Winterfield Elementary School, Columbus, Ga.

Virginia Gillham Tinsley, 63, is a member, Tempe Union High School Board of Education, Tempe, Ariz.

Maria Pornaby Shuhi, 60, is a teacher at Carver Middle School, Del Ray Beach, Fla.

Helen J. Valerio, 43, is executive vice president, Papa Gino's of America, Inc., Needham Heights, Mass.

Note: Miss Phillips' nomination, which was submitted to the Senate on April 5, was withdrawn by the President on June 17.

The President's News Conference March 31, 1982

The President. I have a statement which I shall read for the sound media that I know has been distributed.

Nuclear Arms Reductions

Twice in my lifetime I've seen the world plunged blindly into global wars that inflicted untold suffering upon millions of innocent people. I share the determination of today's young people that such a tragedy, which would be rendered even more terrible by the monstrous inhumane weapons in the world's nuclear arsenals, must never happen again. My goal is to reduce nuclear weapons dramatically, assuring lasting peace and security.

Last November, I stressed our commitment to negotiate in good faith for the reduction of both nuclear and conventional weapons. I made a specific proposal to eliminate entirely the intermediate-range missiles. We remain committed to those goals.

In Geneva we've proposed a treaty with the Soviet Union which embodies our proposals. In Vienna, along with our allies, we're negotiating reductions of conventional forces in Europe. And here in Washington, we're completing preparations for talks with the Soviets on strategic weapons reductions.

We know all too well from past experience that negotiations with the Soviet

previous years. Now, I know I'm running the risk of oversimplifying, but I'm also running out of time. The unadjusted figures are simply the actual count of how many are employed and how many are unemployed in a certain month.

Under the seasonally adjusted figures, unemployment, as we know, went up to 9.4 percent in April, higher than the March figure of 9 percent. And that, of course, is bad news. But according to the unadjusted figures, there were 400,000 more people actually working in April than in March and 300,000 fewer unemployed. Likewise, when the figures were announced a month ago, unemployment increased from March over February, according to the adjusted figures. And yet by the actual count, there were 525,000 more people working in March than February and 88,000 fewer unem-

ployed.

Now, I'm sure that next month when 750,000 or more young people are suddenly out of school, the adjusted figures might look better than the unadjusted. But shouldn't we be allowed to see both?

Regardless, the figures are sad. And something must be done and can be done about unemployment if Congress will get off the dime and adopt the deficit-reducing budget it now has before it. Interest rates will come down when it does, and so will unemployment.

This is no time for politics as usual. There are too many people hurting.

Thanks for listening, and God bless you.

Note: The President spoke at 12:05 p.m. from the Oval Office at the White House.

Message on the Observance of National Nursing Home Week, May 9-15, 1982

May 8, 1982

In observing National Nursing Home Week, we call to mind the special needs of the frail and elderly men and women who live in nursing homes and acknowledge that we all can play a part in meeting those needs.

We often forget that nursing home residents need more than medical care. They also have special social and human needs. Friends and relatives and dedicated staff members can do a great deal. But varied

social contacts add to health and contentment, and we all can contribute as members of our communities by volunteering our time or other help.

As we observe National Nursing Home Week, please join me in honoring those who live in nursing homes and in working to assure them the quality of care and compassion they so richly deserve.

RONALD REAGAN

Address at Commencement Exercises at Eureka College in Illinois May 9, 1982

President Gilbert, trustees, administration and faculty, students, and the friends of Eureka College, and particularly those whose day this is, the graduating class of '82:

Dan, you said the 25th and now the 50th.

Do you mind if I try for the 75th?¹

But it goes without saying that this is a

¹ *The President was commemorating the 50th anniversary of his graduation from Eureka College.*

the Soviet Union has refused to allow the people of Poland to decide their own fate, just as it refused to allow the people of Hungary to decide theirs in 1956, or the people of Czechoslovakia in 1968.

If martial law in Poland is lifted, if all the political prisoners are released, and if a dialog is restored with the Solidarity Union, the United States is prepared to join in a program of economic support. Water cannons and clubs against the Polish people are hardly the kind of dialog that gives us hope. It's up to the Soviets and their client regimes to show good faith by concrete actions.

The fourth point is arms reduction. I know that this weighs heavily on many of your minds. In our 1931 Prism, we quoted Carl Sandburg, who in his own beautiful way quoted the Mother Prairie, saying, "Have you seen a red sunset drip over one of my cornfields, the shore of night stars, the wave lines of dawn up a wheat valley?" What an idyllic scene that paints in our minds—and what a nightmarish prospect that a huge mushroom cloud might someday destroy such beauty. My duty as President is to ensure that the ultimate nightmare never occurs, that the prairies and the cities and the people who inhabit them remain free and untouched by nuclear conflict.

I wish more than anything there were a simple policy that would eliminate that nuclear danger. But there are only difficult policy choices through which we can achieve a stable nuclear balance at the lowest possible level.

I do not doubt that the Soviet people, and, yes, the Soviet leaders have an overriding interest in preventing the use of nuclear weapons. The Soviet Union within the memory of its leaders has known the devastation of total conventional war and knows that nuclear war would be even more calamitous. And yet, so far, the Soviet Union has used arms control negotiations primarily as an instrument to restrict U.S. defense programs and, in conjunction with their own arms buildup, a means to enhance Soviet power and prestige.

Unfortunately, for some time suspicions have grown that the Soviet Union has not been living up to its obligations under exist-

ing arms control treaties. There is conclusive evidence the Soviet Union has provided toxins to the Laotians and Vietnamese for use against defenseless villagers in Southeast Asia. And the Soviets themselves are employing chemical weapons on the freedom-fighters in Afghanistan.

We must establish firm criteria for arms control in the 1980's if we're to secure genuine and lasting restraint on Soviet military programs throughout arms control. We must seek agreements which are verifiable, equitable, and militarily significant. Agreements that provide only the appearance of arms control breed dangerous illusions.

Last November, I committed the United States to seek significant reductions on nuclear and conventional forces. In Geneva, we have since proposed limits on U.S. and Soviet **intermediate-range missiles, including the complete elimination of the most threatening systems on both sides.** In Vienna, we're negotiating, together with our allies, for reductions of conventional forces in Europe. In the 40-nation Committee on Disarmament, the United Nations [United States]³ seeks a total ban on all chemical weapons.

Since the first days of my administration, we've been working on our approach to the crucial issue of strategic arms and the control and negotiations for control of those arms with the Soviet Union. The study and analysis required has been complex and difficult. It had to be undertaken deliberately, thoroughly, and correctly. We've laid a solid basis for these negotiations. We're consulting with congressional leaders and with our allies, and we are now ready to proceed.

The main threat to peace posed by nuclear weapons today is the growing instability of the nuclear balance. This is due to the increasingly destructive potential of the massive Soviet buildup in its ballistic missile force.

Therefore, our goal is to enhance deterrence and achieve stability through significant reductions in the most destabilizing nuclear systems, ballistic missiles, and especially the giant intercontinental ballistic missiles, while maintaining a nuclear capa-

³ White House correction.

hower, saw this when he quoted that young Frenchman, de Tocqueville's line: "America is great because America is good. And if America ever ceases to be good, America will cease to be great."

All of us are aware of the reservoir of goodness which lies waiting to be tapped. Let's make it our job—everyone's job—to encourage our fellow citizens to do those good works which need to be done. With the help of God we can and we will keep

America the great and the free nation that it is.

Thank you again for what you're doing and for your presence here today. God bless you.

Note: The President spoke at 1:27 p.m. in the International Ballroom at the Conrad Hilton Hotel. Prior to his remarks, he attended a reception for luncheon headtable guests at the hotel.

Remarks and a Question-and-Answer Session With the Student Body of Providence-St. Mel High School in Chicago, Illinois May 10, 1982

The President. Well, Mr. Adams,¹ to the teachers here at this school, and to all of you students, I can't quite describe what a pleasure this is for us. We're here because we heard about this school. We heard what beginning with one man to save a school has developed into an educational institution of which you all must be very proud, because there aren't too many educational institutions in the country that can match your record. And we had to see this for ourselves—not just to see it for ourselves but also because we hope that we can spread the word.

And maybe I can illustrate what I'm trying to say was when I was Governor of California, every year they used to bring to the capital a group of students who'd come from other countries and who, on an exchange-student basis, would spend a year in our schools, usually in high school. And every year I had the same question for them. I would say, "Tell me"—these students from all over, Europe and every place else—I'd say, "Tell me, how do our schools compare? Are they tougher than yours? Is the work harder?" And then I'd have to wait until they stopped laughing. That was their assessment of the difference, and I'm talking about schools that weren't like yours. I wish we could get some of them in

¹Paul Adams, principal of Providence-St. Mel High School.

here. I don't think they'd laugh, because I think they'd find out that you met the same educational levels they do.

The other day, yesterday, about a hundred miles south of here at the little college I attended, I spoke at the graduation down there. And I used that occasion to talk to them about something that's very close to my heart and, I'm sure, must be to yours. And that is our intention to engage the Soviet Union in negotiations to reduce the nuclear weapons that are threatening the world and to reduce all of our military power on both sides and then get down to where we can begin to exchange ideas and convince them that the world doesn't mean them harm and that we can get along in the world together—because there've been four wars in my lifetime. There's one dream I have; if I can do one thing with this job, it is to see that no other generation of young Americans will ever have to go out and bleed their lives into somebody's battlefield. And I hope that we can bring that peace about.

But I'm not going to go on talking other than to tell you that you have every reason to be proud, and I'm going to see that a lot of people find out about you and are proud themselves of what you've done. You have reason to be proud of your teachers who obviously are ready to double in brass and do whatever has to be done in order to keep this school going.

and as it developed, this was turned around and I tried to provide tax exemption. It still practiced segregation. I know there were any— I should have, but I didn't. I'm around of what I had to do. I said to the Secretary

that's the case, let's get there and let the Congress make sure that there are no loopholes—or any segregated

that went wrong and this is the only way we've ever publicly asked in what I was doing. I'm sure.

High School

My name is Leavy and I'd like to know—just a

And say, that mike is a little bit off. I felt that mike up a little bit.

High schools in the United States—have you chosen Provisional?

Why did I choose this one? I thought about it a week or two before I put it out, and I saw some television. And I said, this

I've led a private initiative group nationwide to try to get volunteer help for things that are going on. People are doing for waiting for government action to see this. And I'm here, very frankly, and because if ever there's one person can bring it to happen, he's made

that there are millions of people all over this country with the education their children get in schools—the lack of anything else. And with so much of education being light that, as I said in

the beginning, I want to spread the word. This is the way it should be done. You're doing it.

Q. Thank you.

Nuclear Weapons

Q. Mr. President, my name is Corlis Phillips, and I would like to know why does the United States have to have nuclear weapons instead of just relying on conventional weapons?

The President. This question's being asked, I know, a lot, and this is why yesterday I made my speech about a reduction—because nuclear weapons do exist and because the Soviet Union has built up such an arsenal of nuclear weapons.

Up until now, the only deterrent that you have—because there is no defense against that weapon—so the only defense is that you have to be able to threaten them that it can happen to them if they try to make it happen to someone else. And, as a matter of fact, we've been kind of the umbrella of protection for our allies in Europe, for Japan, for other countries in having this arsenal.

Now, the Soviet Union has gone beyond us. It's reached the point that there's just no reason in it, and it is too dangerous to have these things pointed at the world. In Europe, for example, the Russians had a missile called the SS-20, a nuclear missile. It was called an intermediate range, because it couldn't come across the ocean and hit us, but it was targeted on all the cities of Europe. And Europe had nothing to counter it. So, our NATO allies asked us if a weapon that we have designed, called the Pershing missile, could be made and installed in Europe to counter this threat of the SS-20 so the Russians would know if they tried to use those, the Europeans had something to use back.

And I challenged, in November, the Russians to join us in a total elimination of those weapons. And right now we have a team in Geneva, Switzerland, negotiating with the Russians, and we have put on the table a treaty calling for a total elimination of their SS-20's and no implanting of our Pershing missiles in all of Europe. And, so far, the Russians—their first offer was back, they suggested that we freeze the weapons

the way they were. Well now, you can figure out what that means. They wanted to freeze the weapons with 900 nuclear warheads aimed at Europe, and Europe has none aimed at them. I don't think that's a very fair freeze. So, we're trying to get those eliminated.

Now we want to go into negotiations on all of them, but it has to be—we can't do it unilaterally. Can you imagine what would happen in the world if you left the Soviet Union, with its pattern of aggression, with the fact that what it's doing in Afghanistan, how it's shown that it wants to interfere in other countries—if we did away with ours and left them with those thousands and thousands of missiles, that in 28 minutes from the time someone pushes the button could be hitting the targets in our country? So, we have said to them, "All right. Let's both of us start reducing those weapons down, keeping—and being equal, and get them down to where they don't constitute the threat. And of course the ultimate goal that we could all dream of is the same one that's in Geneva now, getting rid of them forever."

And believe it or not, you can be proud of your country. Under President Eisenhower, a number of years ago, this country, we had the weapon then, and the Soviet Union was just beginning to try and build them. But we had them, and President Eisenhower offered to the Soviets and to the world to turn all such weapons over to an international body like the United Nations and take all of them away as a threat between nations. And the Soviet Union refused. So, we're going to try again.

Q. Thank you.

Gun Control

Q. My name is Toni Duffy—

The President. Oh, could I just finish with the three that are there, then?

All right. He tells me my time is up. We'll take these three then. I'm sorry.

Q. —and I would like to ask you what are your feelings concerning gun control?

The President. What?

Q. What are your feelings concerning gun control?

The President. Oh, feelings concerning

French Television 1, Sergio Telmon of Italian Television-RAI, Martin Bell of BBC Television, and Hans-Dieter Kronzucker of German Television-ZDF.

Proclamation 4945—National Orchestra Week, 1982 June 1, 1982

By the President of the United States of America

A Proclamation

America's 1572 symphony and chamber orchestras are among this Nation's finest cultural and artistic resources. Each year, our orchestras provide inspiration and enjoyment to more than 23 million people throughout the country.

This country's orchestras are internationally recognized as being among the finest in the world. They set the standards of excellence against which other musical endeavors are measured.

Orchestras contribute more to their community than fine concert music. Today, orchestras serve their communities in many ways. They reach audiences beyond the concert hall through regional and national tours, free outdoor concerts and benefit performances. In addition, orchestras offer educational programs which introduce school age children to the lasting beauty of music. Orchestras also cooperate in joint artistic ventures, thereby helping to support a multitude of additional arts activity in their communities.

The success of America's orchestras has been the result of the combined effort of skilled professionals and dedicated volunteers. It is their partnership with the government and the private sector which en-

ables them to promote and produce music in their communities.

These orchestras provide the opportunity for American trained musicians and conductors to promote the performance of American music. The American orchestra both builds and preserves our Nation's heritage.

In recognition of the contribution of America's orchestras to the Nation, Congress has, by Senate Joint Resolution 145, requested me to designate June 13-19, 1982, as National Orchestra Week.

Now, Therefore, I, Ronald Reagan, President of the United States of America, do hereby designate the week of June 13-19, 1982 as National Orchestra Week and call upon all Federal, State and local government agencies, interested groups and organizations, and the people of the United States to observe that week by engaging in appropriate programs and activities, thereby showing their support of America's orchestras and the arts.

In Witness Whereof, I have hereunto set my hand this 1st day of June, in the year of our Lord nineteen hundred and eighty-two, and of the Independence of United States of America the two hundred and sixth.

RONALD REAGAN

[Filed with the Office of the Federal Register, 11:42 a.m., June 2, 1982]

Remarks to Administration Officials and White House Staff on Departure for Europe

June 2, 1982

Who's tending the store? *[Laughter]*

Well, I think we've got everything packed, and Nancy's upstairs unplugging

the toaster. *[Laughter]*

I guess we're ready to go. But in case anyone's wondering whether this trip is

s-Dieter Kronzucker of
'DF.

2

te and produce music

rovide the opportunity
musicians and conduc-
performance of Ameri-
merican orchestra both
our Nation's heritage.
the contribution of
to the Nation, Con-
Joint Resolution 145,
esignate June 13-19,
estra Week.

Ronald Reagan, Presi-
itates of America, do
week of June 13-19,
hestra Week and call
te and local govern-
ed groups and orga-
ople of the United
week by engaging in
and activities, there-
ort of America's or-

I have hereunto set
f June, in the year of
dred and eighty-two,
ice of United States
dred and sixth.

RONALD REAGAN

f the Federal Regis-
982]

Staff on

to go. But in case
ether this trip is

necessary, let me say a word or two about
what we hope to accomplish.

I think one of the highest duties that goes
with this office is to carry on the pursuit of
peace and prosperity for our people. For
more than three decades that pursuit has
led to consultation and cooperation with
our neighbors here on this continent, and
with Japan, and with our friends and allies
in the Western World, in Europe, those na-
tions that share our democratic ideals.

Together we've weathered threats of ag-
gression and internal disagreements, but
we've maintained a sense of unity and a
commitment to freedom, and we're still
being tested, possibly more now than ever
before. It's important, for that reason, to
meet and renew our bond.

Now, I know there are some who ques-
tion the value of the Alliance, who view it
as cumbersome and at times unresponsive
to the need for action. And there are those
people still in our land who yearn for the
isolationist shell. But because we've rejected
those other courses back over the recent
decades, there has been peace for almost 40
years on the Western front.

This administration's foreign policy began
last year. It included the reestablishment of
our American strength and the revitaliza-
tion of our economy. We put the economic
recovery program and the defense plan into
place. This country never sought the leader-
ship that was thrust upon us at the end of
World War II, but what we have done, I
think, in this last year, is reaffirm to our
friends abroad and to possible adversaries
that we accept that responsibility.

In meeting with the industrial democra-
cies in Versailles, we should see more clear-
ly where and how we mean to have a
better economic future. That summit meet-
ing is an opportunity to work for real, sus-
tained, noninflationary growth after nearly
a decade of stagnation, low productivity,
and investment and energy vulnerability.
We've been in the longest period of sus-
tained inflation, worldwide inflation, in the
history of the world. I intend to propose
regular and closer consultation among us so
we can together pursue economic policies
that move in the same direction, first, to
reduce inflation, and then to have greater
monetary and fiscal discipline.

We must look for ways to strengthen the
international trading system with more reli-
ance on the free market. It's time that we
take a stand against the increasing drift in
so many parts of the world, and even here
at home, toward protectionism.

There are other meetings besides Ver-
sailles—I'll say—[laughter]—in London, in
Rome, in Bonn, and in Berlin. I look for-
ward to meeting with His Holiness the
Pope in the Vatican. And the NATO meet-
ing in Bonn—there we'll have a chance to
explain in detail our plans for engaging the
Soviet Union in realistic arms reduction
talks.

I know that you're aware that last
November we took up the issue and pro-
posed to the Soviet Union negotiations lead-
ing toward a zero level, the elimination of
intermediate-range weapons, their SS-20's
and -4's and -5's in Europe, and the de-
ploying of our Pershings and cruise missiles
as a deterrent to those forces—a total eli-
mination of those forces—and that, now, that
treaty that we proposed is on the table in
Geneva, and our teams are negotiating
there. And then, a short time ago, in
Eureka College, I spoke of START, Strate-
gic Arms Reduction Talks, and the day
before yesterday was able to announce that
those talks will begin 27 days from now, on
the 29th of June, in Geneva.

Now, if it is, as it appears to be, that
we're destined to play a leadership role,
then we shall do so with one purpose in
mind—to affirm and protect the fundamen-
tal values of our people and the people of
those countries that are allied to us in this
determination to be free. Our societies are
a reflection of all that is good and decent in
humankind.

Something will happen on this trip also in
Bonn. There will be a ceremony, and Spain
will become a member of NATO and the
North Atlantic Alliance. I wonder if any of
us have really thought about the signifi-
cance of that. Over and above our welcome
to another democracy to join us in that alli-
ance, when have we ever seen or will we
ever see a nation ask to join the Warsaw
Pact? It just won't happen. For that matter,
where else in the world can people take to
the streets to demonstrate their opposition

to nuclear warfare?

There's been near a decade of troubling events and uncertainty among the allies and ourselves, but today there is a regrowth of unity and purpose. And I hope that this trip will contribute to that and increase it.

So, that's my reason for going. And I can only tell you that I shall be more proud than I've ever been of anything to be there representing the United States, with an opportunity once again to express to all of them and to the world what it is we think we represent, what it is we want for all the people of the world.

And now, as the little girl said to me in the postscript to her letter, once, about what I should do after taking all her advice in the letter, about getting to the Oval

Office, and get back to work, well, we're leaving, but—get back to work. [Laughter]

No, incidentally, I couldn't leave here without just saying to all of you, now that we have you here and in a group, God bless you all, and thank you for all that you've been doing. I know that what we've been doing doesn't read well in the Washington Post or the New York Times, but believe me, it reads well in Peoria.

Thanks a lot. Goodby. See you later.

Note: The President spoke at 9:31 a.m. in the East Room at the White House. Following his remarks, he left from the South Lawn for Andrews Air Force Base, Md. From there he flew to Paris, France.

Message to the Congress on Trade With Romania, Hungary, and the People's Republic of China

June 2, 1982

To the Congress of the United States:

In accordance with subsection 402(d)(5) of the Trade Act of 1974, I transmit herewith my recommendation for a further 12-month extension of the authority to waive subsection (a) and (b) of Section 402 of the Act.

I include as part of my recommendation my determination that further extension of the waiver authority, and continuation of the waivers applicable to the Socialist Republic of Romania, the Hungarian People's Republic, and the People's Republic of China will substantially promote the objectives of Section 402.

This recommendation also includes my reasons for recommending the extension of waiver authority and for my determination that continuation of the three waivers currently in effect will substantially promote the objectives of Section 402. It also states my concern about Romania's emigration record this year and the need for its reexamination.

RONALD REAGAN

The White House,
June 2, 1982.

RECOMMENDATION FOR EXTENSION OF WAIVER AUTHORITY

I recommend to the Congress that the waiver authority granted by subsection 402(c) of the Trade Act of 1974 (hereinafter "the Act") be further extended for twelve months. Pursuant to subsection 402(d)(5) of the Act, I have today determined that further extension of such authority, and continuation of the waivers currently applicable to the Socialist Republic of Romania, the Hungarian People's Republic, and the People's Republic of China will substantially promote the objectives of section 402 of the Act. However, I am concerned about Romania's emigration record this year and suggest it be reexamined. My determination is attached to this Recommendation and is incorporated herein.

The general waiver authority conferred by section 402(c) of the Act is an important means for the strengthening of mutually beneficial relations between the United States and certain countries of Eastern Europe and the People's Republic of China. The waiver authority has permitted us to conclude and maintain in force bilateral

the exchange of young students between their countries which will begin in 1982.

The two governments agreed to begin regular meetings to discuss cultural and information matters with the desire to improve cultural programs and in order to examine means of strengthening relations in these fields. The first cultural and informa-

tion talks will be held in Washington in October.

The two sides concluded their talks by welcoming recent decisions to strengthen mutual consultations as an expression of the special and close relationship which Italy and the United States enjoy.

Address to Members of the British Parliament

June 8, 1982

My Lord Chancellor, Mr. Speaker:

The journey of which this visit forms a part is a long one. Already it has taken me to two great cities of the West, Rome and Paris, and to the economic summit at Versailles. And there, once again, our sister democracies have proved that even in a time of severe economic strain, free peoples can work together freely and voluntarily to address problems as serious as inflation, unemployment, trade, and economic development in a spirit of cooperation and solidarity.

Other milestones lie ahead. Later this week, in Germany, we and our NATO allies will discuss measures for our joint defense and America's latest initiatives for a more peaceful, secure world through arms reductions.

Each stop of this trip is important, but among them all, this moment occupies a special place in my heart and in the hearts of my countrymen—a moment of kinship and homecoming in these hallowed halls.

Speaking for all Americans, I want to say how very much at home we feel in your house. Every American would, because this is, as we have been so eloquently told, one of democracy's shrines. Here the rights of free people and the processes of representation have been debated and refined.

It has been said that an institution is the lengthening shadow of a man. This institution is the lengthening shadow of all the men and women who have sat here and all those who have voted to send representatives here.

This is my second visit to Great Britain as President of the United States. My first op-

portunity to stand on British soil occurred almost a year and a half ago when your Prime Minister graciously hosted a diplomatic dinner at the British Embassy in Washington. Mrs. Thatcher said then that she hoped I was not distressed to find staring down at me from the grand staircase a portrait of His Royal Majesty King George III. She suggested it was best to let bygones be bygones, and in view of our two countries' remarkable friendship in succeeding years, she added that most Englishmen today would agree with Thomas Jefferson that "a little rebellion now and then is a very good thing." [Laughter]

Well, from here I will go to Bonn and then Berlin, where there stands a grim symbol of power untamed. The Berlin Wall, that dreadful gray gash across the city, is in its third decade. It is the fitting signature of the regime that built it.

And a few hundred kilometers behind the Berlin Wall, there is another symbol. In the center of Warsaw, there is a sign that notes the distances to two capitals. In one direction it points toward Moscow. In the other it points toward Brussels, headquarters of Western Europe's tangible unity. The marker says that the distances from Warsaw to Moscow and Warsaw to Brussels are equal. The sign makes this point: Poland is not East or West. Poland is at the center of European civilization. It has contributed mightily to that civilization. It is doing so today by being magnificently unreconciled to oppression.

Poland's struggle to be Poland and to secure the basic rights we often take for

granted demonstrates why we dare not take those rights for granted. Gladstone, defending the Reform Bill of 1866, declared, "You cannot fight against the future. Time is on our side." It was easier to believe in the march of democracy in Gladstone's day—in that high noon of Victorian optimism.

We're approaching the end of a bloody century plagued by a terrible political invention—totalitarianism. Optimism comes less easily today, not because democracy is less vigorous, but because democracy's enemies have refined their instruments of repression. Yet optimism is in order, because day by day democracy is proving itself to be a not-at-all-fragile flower. From Stettin on the Baltic to Varna on the Black Sea, the regimes planted by totalitarianism have had more than 30 years to establish their legitimacy. But none—not one regime—has yet been able to risk free elections. Regimes planted by bayonets do not take root.

The strength of the Solidarity movement in Poland demonstrates the truth told in an underground joke in the Soviet Union. It is that the Soviet Union would remain a one-party nation even if an opposition party were permitted, because everyone would join the opposition party. *[Laughter]*

America's time as a player on the stage of world history has been brief. I think understanding this fact has always made you patient with your younger cousins—well, not always patient. I do recall that on one occasion, Sir Winston Churchill said in exasperation about one of our most distinguished diplomats: "He is the only case I know of a bull who carries his china shop with him." *[Laughter]*

But witty as Sir Winston was, he also had that special attribute of great statesmen—the gift of vision, the willingness to see the future based on the experience of the past. It is this sense of history, this understanding of the past that I want to talk with you about today, for it is in remembering what we share of the past that our two nations can make common cause for the future.

We have not inherited an easy world. If developments like the Industrial Revolution, which began here in England, and the gifts of science and technology have made life much easier for us, they have also made it more dangerous. There are threats now

to our freedom, indeed to our very existence, that other generations could never even have imagined.

There is first the threat of global war. No President, no Congress, no Prime Minister, no Parliament can spend a day entirely free of this threat. And I don't have to tell you that in today's world the existence of nuclear weapons could mean, if not the extinction of mankind, then surely the end of civilization as we know it. That's why negotiations on intermediate-range nuclear forces now underway in Europe and the START talks—Strategic Arms Reduction Talks—which will begin later this month, are not just critical to American or Western policy; they are critical to mankind. Our commitment to early success in these negotiations is firm and unshakable, and our purpose is clear: reducing the risk of war by reducing the means of waging war on both sides.

At the same time there is a threat posed to human freedom by the enormous power of the modern state. History teaches the dangers of government that overreaches—political control taking precedence over free economic growth, secret police, mindless bureaucracy, all combining to stifle individual excellence and personal freedom.

Now, I'm aware that among us here and throughout Europe there is legitimate disagreement over the extent to which the public sector should play a role in a nation's economy and life. But on one point all of us are united—our abhorrence of dictatorship in all its forms, but most particularly totalitarianism and the terrible inhumanities it has caused in our time—the great purge, Auschwitz and Dachau, the Gulag, and Cambodia.

Historians looking back at our time will note the consistent restraint and peaceful intentions of the West. They will note that it was the democracies who refused to use the threat of their nuclear monopoly in the forties and early fifties for territorial or imperial gain. Had that nuclear monopoly been in the hands of the Communist world, the map of Europe—indeed, the world—would look very different today. And certainly they will note it was not the democracies that invaded Afghanistan or su-

pressed Polish Solidarity or used chemical and toxin warfare in Afghanistan and South-east Asia.

If history teaches anything it teaches self-delusion in the face of unpleasant facts is folly. We see around us today the marks of our terrible dilemma—predictions of doomsday, antinuclear demonstrations, an arms race in which the West must, for its own protection, be an unwilling participant. At the same time we see totalitarian forces in the world who seek subversion and conflict around the globe to further their barbarous assault on the human spirit. What, then, is our course? Must civilization perish in a hail of fiery atoms? Must freedom wither in a quiet, deadening accommodation with totalitarian evil?

Sir Winston Churchill refused to accept the inevitability of war or even that it was imminent. He said, "I do not believe that Soviet Russia desires war. What they desire is the fruits of war and the indefinite expansion of their power and doctrines. But what we have to consider here today while time remains is the permanent prevention of war and the establishment of conditions of freedom and democracy as rapidly as possible in all countries."

Well, this is precisely our mission today: to preserve freedom as well as peace. It may not be easy to see; but I believe we live now at a turning point.

In an ironic sense Karl Marx was right. We are witnessing today a great revolutionary crisis, a crisis where the demands of the economic order are conflicting directly with those of the political order. But the crisis is happening not in the free, non-Marxist West, but in the home of Marxist-Leninism, the Soviet Union. It is the Soviet Union that runs against the tide of history by denying human freedom and human dignity to its citizens. It also is in deep economic difficulty. The rate of growth in the national product has been steadily declining since the fifties and is less than half of what it was then.

The dimensions of this failure are astounding: A country which employs one-fifth of its population in agriculture is unable to feed its own people. Were it not for the private sector, the tiny private sector tolerated in Soviet agriculture, the

country might be on the brink of famine. These private plots occupy a bare 3 percent of the arable land but account for nearly one-quarter of Soviet farm output and nearly one-third of meat products and vegetables. Overcentralized, with little or no incentives, year after year the Soviet system pours its best resource into the making of instruments of destruction. The constant shrinkage of economic growth combined with the growth of military production is putting a heavy strain on the Soviet people. What we see here is a political structure that no longer corresponds to its economic base, a society where productive forces are hampered by political ones.

The decay of the Soviet experiment should come as no surprise to us. Wherever the comparisons have been made between free and closed societies—West Germany and East Germany, Austria and Czechoslovakia, Malaysia and Vietnam—it is the democratic countries what are prosperous and responsive to the needs of their people. And one of the simple but overwhelming facts of our time is this: Of all the millions of refugees we've seen in the modern world, their flight is always away from, not toward the Communist world. Today on the NATO line, our military forces face east to prevent a possible invasion. On the other side of the line, the Soviet forces also face east to prevent their people from leaving.

The hard evidence of totalitarian rule has caused in mankind an uprising of the intellect and will. Whether it is the growth of the new schools of economics in America or England or the appearance of the so-called new philosophers in France, there is one unifying thread running through the intellectual work of these groups—rejection of the arbitrary power of the state, the refusal to subordinate the rights of the individual to the superstate, the realization that collectivism stifles all the best human impulses.

Since the exodus from Egypt, historians have written of those who sacrificed and struggled for freedom—the stand at Thermopylae, the revolt of Spartacus, the storming of the Bastille, the Warsaw uprising in World War II. More recently we've seen evidence of this same human impulse in one of the developing nations in Central

America. For months and months the world news media covered the fighting in El Salvador. Day after day we were treated to stories and film slanted toward the brave freedom-fighters battling oppressive government forces in behalf of the silent, suffering people of that tortured country.

And then one day those silent, suffering people were offered a chance to vote, to choose the kind of government they wanted. Suddenly the freedom-fighters in the hills were exposed for what they really are—Cuban-backed guerrillas who want power for themselves, and their backers, not democracy for the people. They threatened death to any who voted, and destroyed hundreds of buses and trucks to keep the people from getting to the polling places. But on election day, the people of El Salvador, an unprecedented 1.4 million of them, braved ambush and gunfire, and trudged for miles to vote for freedom.

They stood for hours in the hot sun waiting for their turn to vote. Members of our Congress who went there as observers told me of a woman who was wounded by rifle fire on the way to the polls, who refused to leave the line to have her wound treated until after she had voted. A grandmother, who had been told by the guerrillas she would be killed when she returned from the polls, and she told the guerrillas, "You can kill me, you can kill my family, kill my neighbors, but you can't kill us all." The real freedom-fighters of El Salvador turned out to be the people of that country—the young, the old, the in-between.

Strange, but in my own country there's been little if any news coverage of that war since the election. Now, perhaps they'll say it's—well, because there are newer struggles now.

On distant islands in the South Atlantic young men are fighting for Britain. And, yes, voices have been raised protesting their sacrifice for lumps of rock and earth so far away. But those young men aren't fighting for mere real estate. They fight for a cause—for the belief that armed aggression must not be allowed to succeed, and the people must participate in the decisions of government—[*applause*]—the decisions of government under the rule of law. If there had been firmer support for that principle

some 45 years ago, perhaps our generation wouldn't have suffered the bloodletting of World War II.

In the Middle East now the guns sound once more, this time in Lebanon, a country that for too long has had to endure the tragedy of civil war, terrorism, and foreign intervention and occupation. The fighting in Lebanon on the part of all parties must stop, and Israel should bring its forces home. But this is not enough. We must all work to stamp out the scourge of terrorism that in the Middle East makes war an ever-present threat.

But beyond the troublespots lies a deeper, more positive pattern. Around the world today, the democratic revolution is gathering new strength. In India a critical test has been passed with the peaceful change of governing political parties. In Africa, Nigeria is moving into remarkable and unmistakable ways to build and strengthen its democratic institutions. In the Caribbean and Central America, 16 of 24 countries have freely elected governments. And in the United Nations, 8 of the 10 developing nations which have joined that body in the past 5 years are democracies.

In the Communist world as well, man's instinctive desire for freedom and self-determination surfaces again and again. To be sure, there are grim reminders of how brutally the police state attempts to snuff out this quest for self-rule—1953 in East Germany, 1956 in Hungary, 1968 in Czechoslovakia, 1981 in Poland. But the struggle continues in Poland. And we know that there are even those who strive and suffer for freedom within the confines of the Soviet Union itself. How we conduct ourselves here in the Western democracies will determine whether this trend continues.

No, democracy is not a fragile flower. Still it needs cultivating. If the rest of this century is to witness the gradual growth of freedom and democratic ideals, we must take actions to assist the campaign for democracy.

Some argue that we should encourage democratic change in right-wing dictatorships, but not in Communist regimes. Well, to accept this preposterous notion—as some

well-meaning people have—is to invite the argument that once countries achieve a nuclear capability, they should be allowed an undisturbed reign of terror over their own citizens. We reject this course.

As for the Soviet view, Chairman Brezhnev repeatedly has stressed that the competition of ideas and systems must continue and that this is entirely consistent with relaxation of tensions and peace.

Well, we ask only that these systems begin by living up to their own constitutions, abiding by their own laws, and complying with the international obligations they have undertaken. We ask only for a process, a direction, a basic code of decency, not for an instant transformation.

We cannot ignore the fact that even without our encouragement there has been and will continue to be repeated explosions against repression and dictatorships. The Soviet Union itself is not immune to this reality. Any system is inherently unstable that has no peaceful means to legitimize its leaders. In such cases, the very repressiveness of the state ultimately drives people to resist it, if necessary, by force.

While we must be cautious about forcing the pace of change, we must not hesitate to declare our ultimate objectives and to take concrete actions to move toward them. We must be staunch in our conviction that freedom is not the sole prerogative of a lucky few, but the inalienable and universal right of all human beings. So states the United Nations Universal Declaration of Human Rights, which, among other things, guarantees free elections.

The objective I propose is quite simple to state: to foster the infrastructure of democracy, the system of a free press, unions, political parties, universities, which allows a people to choose their own way to develop their own culture, to reconcile their own differences through peaceful means.

This is not cultural imperialism, it is providing the means for genuine self-determination and protection for diversity. Democracy already flourishes in countries with very different cultures and historical experiences. It would be cultural condescension, or worse, to say that any people prefer dictatorship to democracy. Who would voluntarily choose not to have the right to vote,

decide to purchase government propaganda handouts instead of independent newspapers, prefer government to worker-controlled unions, opt for land to be owned by the state instead of those who till it, want government repression of religious liberty, a single political party instead of a free choice, a rigid cultural orthodoxy instead of democratic tolerance and diversity?

Since 1917 the Soviet Union has given covert political training and assistance to Marxist-Leninists in many countries. Of course, it also has promoted the use of violence and subversion by these same forces. Over the past several decades, West European and other Social Democrats, Christian Democrats, and leaders have offered open assistance to fraternal, political, and social institutions to bring about peaceful and democratic progress. Appropriately, for a vigorous new democracy, the Federal Republic of Germany's political foundations have become a major force in this effort.

We in America now intend to take additional steps, as many of our allies have already done, toward realizing this same goal. The chairmen and other leaders of the national Republican and Democratic Party organizations are initiating a study with the bipartisan American political foundation to determine how the United States can best contribute as a nation to the global campaign for democracy now gathering force. They will have the cooperation of congressional leaders of both parties, along with representatives of business, labor, and other major institutions in our society. I look forward to receiving their recommendations and to working with these institutions and the Congress in the common task of strengthening democracy throughout the world.

It is time that we committed ourselves as a nation—in both the public and private sectors—to assisting democratic development.

We plan to consult with leaders of other nations as well. There is a proposal before the Council of Europe to invite parliamentarians from democratic countries to a meeting next year in Strasbourg. That prestigious gathering could consider ways to help democratic political movements.

This November in Washington there will

take place an
elections. An
conference o
tionalism and
Chief Justice
ties from a r
veloped cou
and politician
have agreed
ple into pra
law.

At the sar
Union to con
tion of ideas
mitted to su
peaceful and
I am prepar
an opportun
people on ou
the same
people. We
newsmen f
other's telev

Now, I do
mistic, yet t
from the re
world. It ha
ruling elite
ease domes
pression at
chooses a w
people a vo
this latter.
believe the
cratic mov
global cam
en the prc
world at pe

I have d
cluding my
ments of W
Union to s
tect the pe
a plan and
march of fi
will leave
heap of hist
which stifle
self-expressi
why we
strengthen
ward with
negotiator
and our p

take place an international meeting on free elections. And next spring there will be a conference of world authorities on constitutionalism and self-government hosted by the Chief Justice of the United States. Authorities from a number of developing and developed countries—judges, philosophers, and politicians with practical experience—have agreed to explore how to turn principle into practice and further the rule of law.

At the same time, we invite the Soviet Union to consider with us how the competition of ideas and values—which it is committed to support—can be conducted on a peaceful and reciprocal basis. For example, I am prepared to offer President Brezhnev an opportunity to speak to the American people on our television if he will allow me the same opportunity with the Soviet people. We also suggest that panels of our newsmen periodically appear on each other's television to discuss major events.

Now, I don't wish to sound overly optimistic, yet the Soviet Union is not immune from the reality of what is going on in the world. It has happened in the past—a small ruling elite either mistakenly attempts to ease domestic unrest through greater repression and foreign adventure, or it chooses a wiser course. It begins to allow its people a voice in their own destiny. Even if this latter process is not realized soon, I believe the renewed strength of the democratic movement, complemented by a global campaign for freedom, will strengthen the prospects for arms control and a world at peace.

I have discussed on other occasions, including my address on May 9th, the elements of Western policies toward the Soviet Union to safeguard our interests and protect the peace. What I am describing now is a plan and a hope for the long term—the march of freedom and democracy which will leave Marxism-Leninism on the ash-heap of history as it has left other tyrannies which stifle the freedom and muzzle the self-expression of the people. And that's why we must continue our efforts to strengthen NATO even as we move forward with our Zero-Option initiative in the negotiations on intermediate-range forces and our proposal for a one-third reduction

in strategic ballistic missile warheads.

Our military strength is a prerequisite to peace, but let it be clear we maintain this strength in the hope it will never be used, for the ultimate determinant in the struggle that's now going on in the world will not be bombs and rockets, but a test of wills and ideas, a trial of spiritual resolve, the values we hold, the beliefs we cherish, the ideals to which we are dedicated.

The British people know that, given strong leadership, time and a little bit of hope, the forces of good ultimately rally and triumph over evil. Here among you is the cradle of self-government, the Mother of Parliaments. Here is the enduring greatness of the British contribution to mankind, the great civilized ideas: individual liberty, representative government, and the rule of law under God.

I've often wondered about the shyness of some of us in the West about standing for these ideals that have done so much to ease the plight of man and the hardships of our imperfect world. This reluctance to use those vast resources at our command reminds me of the elderly lady whose home was bombed in the Blitz. As the rescuers moved about, they found a bottle of brandy she'd stored behind the staircase, which was all that was left standing. And since she was barely conscious, one of the workers pulled the cork to give her a taste of it. She came around immediately and said, "Here now—there now, put it back. That's for emergencies." [Laughter]

Well, the emergency is upon us. Let us be shy no longer. Let us go to our strength. Let us offer hope. Let us tell the world that a new age is not only possible but probable.

During the dark days of the Second World War, when this island was incandescent with courage, Winston Churchill exclaimed about Britain's adversaries, "What kind of a people do they think we are?" Well, Britain's adversaries found out what extraordinary people the British are. But all the democracies paid a terrible price for allowing the dictators to underestimate us. We dare not make that mistake again. So, let us ask ourselves, "What kind of people do we think we are?" And let us answer, "Free people, worthy of freedom and deter-

mined not only to remain so but to help others gain their freedom as well."

Sir Winston led his people to great victory in war and then lost an election just as the fruits of victory were about to be enjoyed. But he left office honorably, and, as it turned out, temporarily, knowing that the liberty of his people was more important than the fate of any single leader. History recalls his greatness in ways no dictator will ever know. And he left us a message of hope for the future, as timely now as when he first uttered it, as opposition leader in the Commons nearly 27 years ago, when he said, "When we look back on all the perils through which we have passed and at the mighty foes that we have laid low and all the dark and deadly designs that we have frustrated, why should we fear for our future? We have," he said, "come safely through the worst."

Well, the task I've set forth will long out-

live our own generation. But together, we too have come through the worst. Let us now begin a major effort to secure the best—a crusade for freedom that will engage the faith and fortitude of the next generation. For the sake of peace and justice, let us move toward a world in which all people are at last free to determine their own destiny.

Thank you.

Note: The President spoke at 12:14 p.m. in the Royal Gallery at the Palace of Westminster in London.

On the previous evening, the President was greeted by Queen Elizabeth II in an arrival ceremony at Windsor Castle, near Windsor, England. Later, the Queen hosted a private dinner for the President.

On the morning of June 8, the President and the Queen spent part of the morning horseback riding on the Windsor Castle grounds.

Toasts of the President and British Prime Minister Margaret Thatcher at a Luncheon Honoring the President in London June 8, 1982

The Prime Minister. We are here today to welcome and to honor our great ally, the United States of America. Mr. President, Mrs. Reagan, it's a privilege and a pleasure to have you both here with us. It's rare enough to have an American President as a guest at Number 10, but my researchers have been unable to find out when we last had the honor of the First Lady at Number 10 as well.

President and Mrs. Reagan, your presence gives me and, indeed, many of our guests a chance to repay as best we can the hospitality you bestowed on us when we were your first official guests from abroad at the beginning of your Presidential term of office. I realize, of course, that you've both become accustomed recently to taking your meals in rather grander places—[laughter]—the Palace of Versailles and Windsor Castle. As you can see, this is a very simple house, one which has witnessed

the shaping of our shared history since it first became the abode of Prime Ministers in 1732.

Mr. President, some of us were present this morning to hear your magnificent speech to members of both Houses of Parliament in the historic setting of the Royal Gallery. It was, if I may say so, respectfully, a triumph. We are so grateful to you for putting freedom on the offensive, which is where it should be. You wrote a new chapter in our history—no longer on the defensive but on the offensive. It was, if I might say so, an exceedingly hard act to follow. [Laughter] But I will try to be brief.

Much has been said and written over the years, Mr. President, about the relations between our two countries. And there's no need for me to add to the generalities on the subject today, because we've had before our eyes in recent weeks the most concrete expression of what, in practice, our friend-

ence every minute that we've been here. And we leave strengthened with the knowledge that the great friendship and the great alliance that has existed for so long between our two peoples—the United Kingdom and the United States—remains and is, if anything, stronger than it has ever been.

Note: Prime Minister Thatcher spoke at ap-

proximately 10:30 a.m. outside Number 10 Downing Street.

Also attending the breakfast were Secretary of State Alexander M. Haig, Jr., and British Secretary of State for Foreign & Commonwealth Affairs Francis Pym. Following the breakfast, they were joined by other American and British officials.

Address Before the Bundestag in Bonn, Federal Republic of Germany

June 9, 1982

Mr. President, Chancellor Schmidt, members of the Bundestag, distinguished guests:

Perhaps because I've just come from London, I have this urge to quote the great Dr. Johnson who said, "The feeling of friendship is like that of being comfortably filled with roast beef." [Laughter] Well, I feel very much filled with friendship this afternoon, and I bring you the warmest regards and goodwill of the American people.

I'm very honored to speak to you today and, thus, to all the people of Germany. Next year, we will jointly celebrate the 300th anniversary of the first German settlement in the American Colonies. The 13 families who came to our new land were the forerunners of more than 7 million German immigrants to the United States. Today, more Americans claim German ancestry than any other.

These Germans cleared and cultivated our land, built our industries, and advanced our arts and sciences. In honor of 300 years of German contributions in America, President Carstens and I have agreed today that he will pay an official visit to the United States in October of 1983 to celebrate the occasion.

The German people have given us so much, we like to think that we've repaid some of that debt. Our American Revolution was the first revolution in modern history to be fought for the right of self-government and the guarantee of civil liberties. That spirit was contagious. In 1849, the Frankfurt Parliament's statement of basic

human rights guaranteed freedom of expression, freedom of religion, and equality before the law. And these principles live today in the basic law of the Federal Republic. Many peoples to the east still wait for such rights.

The United States is proud of your democracy, but we cannot take credit for it. Heinrich Heine, in speaking of those who built the awe-inspiring cathedrals of medieval times, said that, "In those days people had convictions. We moderns have only opinions, and it requires something more than opinions," he said, "to build a Gothic cathedral." Well, over the past 30 years, the convictions of the German people have built a cathedral of democracy—a great and glorious testament to your ideals. We in America genuinely admire the free society that you have built in only a few decades, and we understand all the better what you have accomplished because of our own history.

Americans speak with the deepest reverence of those Founding Fathers and first citizens who gave us the freedom that we enjoy today. And even though they lived over 200 years ago, we carry them in our hearts as well as in our history books.

I believe future generations of Germans will look to you here today and to your fellow Germans with the same profound respect and appreciation. You have built a free society with an abiding faith in human dignity—the crowning ideal of Western civilization. This will not be forgotten. You will

merican forces are
oe, and Europe is

recent agreement
upport. This pact
o deter aggression
ates our common
l to attack. Just as
the security of the
ole for shouldering
len. Now that, of
fference of opin-
Alliance is as old as
t voices have now
es of the Atlantic
ole process of ad-
nce for a dramatic

that Europeans
d for their own
nilaterally reduce
troops deployed in
itself, we hear the
presence, rather
ce, either has no
ally increases the
e attacked.

both the history
asatlantic coalition.
he American com-
ains steady and
re our shores. Eu-
rders. And we will
of our heritage of

recognize Europe's
s to our joint
contribution more
Federal Republic.
e forces of six na-
and reservists pro-
TO's conventional
d of Europe. Your
or the integration
lemocratic way of
shrunk from the
epting the nucle-
errence.

illing another re-
can citizens don't
rparts in Europe,
ens, really under-
s presence there.

Now, if you'll work toward explaining the U.S. role to people on this side of the Atlantic, I'll explain it to those on the other side.

In recent months, both in your country and mine, there has been renewed public concern about the threat of nuclear war and the arms buildup. I know it's not easy, especially for the German people, to live in the gale of intimidation that blows from the east.

If I might quote Heine again, he almost foretold the fears of nuclear war when he wrote, "Wild, dark times are rumbling toward us, and the prophet who wishes to write a new apocalypse will have to invent entirely new beasts, and beasts so terrible that the ancient animal symbols will seem like cooing doves and cupids in comparison." The nuclear threat is a terrible beast. Perhaps the banner carried in one of the nuclear demonstrations here in Germany said it best. The sign read, "I am afraid."

Well, I know of no Western leader who doesn't sympathize with that earnest plea. To those who march for peace, my heart is with you. I would be at the head of your parade if I believed marching alone could bring about a more secure world. And to the 2,800 women in Filderstadt who spent a petition for peace to President Brezhnev and me, let me say I, myself, would sign your petition if I thought it could bring about harmony. I understand your genuine concerns.

The women of Filderstadt and I share the same goal. The question is how to proceed. We must think through the consequences of how we reduce the dangers to peace.

Those who advocate that we unilaterally forego the modernization of our forces must prove that this will enhance our security and lead to moderation by the other side—in short, that it will advance, rather than undermine, the preservation of the peace. The weight of recent history does not support this notion.

Those who demand that we renounce the use of a crucial element of our deterrent strategy must show how this would decrease the likelihood of war. It is only by comparison with a nuclear war that the suffering caused by conventional war seems a lesser evil. Our goal must be to deter war of any kind.

And those who decry the failure of arms control efforts to achieve substantial results must consider where the fault lies. I would remind them that it is the United States that has proposed to ban land-based intermediate-range nuclear missiles—the missiles most threatening to Europe. It is the United States that has proposed and will pursue deep cuts in strategic systems. It is the West that has long sought the detailed exchanges of information on forces and effective verification procedures. And it is dictatorships, not democracies, that need militarism to control their own people and impose their system on others.

To those who've taken a different viewpoint and who can't see this danger, I don't suggest that they're ignorant, it's just that they know so many things that aren't true.

We in the West—Germans, Americans, our other Allies—are deeply committed to continuing efforts to restrict the arms competition. Common sense demands that we persevere. I invite those who genuinely seek effective and lasting arms control to stand behind the far-reaching proposals that we've put forward. In return, I pledge that we will sustain the closest of consultations with our Allies.

On November 18th, I outlined a broad and ambitious arms control program. One element calls for reducing land-based intermediate-range nuclear missiles to zero on each side. If carried out, it would eliminate the growing threat to Western Europe posed by the U.S.S.R.'s modern SS-20 rockets, and it would make unnecessary the NATO decision to deploy American intermediate-range systems. And, by the way, I cannot understand why among some, there is a greater fear of weapons NATO is to deploy than of weapons the Soviet Union already has deployed.

Our proposal is fair because it imposes equal limits and obligations on both sides, and it calls for significant reductions, not merely a capping of an existing high level of destructive power. As you know, we've made this proposal in Geneva, where negotiations have been underway since the end of November last year. We intend to pursue those negotiations intensively. I regard them as a significant test of the Soviets'

er than any Europe
tury. And peace in
America.

it, the forces of the
Warsaw Pact are
es from here. They
the people of East-
Curtain wasn't woven
it's there to keep
obvious symbol of this
you know, if I had a
ne Soviet leaders one
y stuff the question
t over the wall when
ly want to hear their
at wall there? Why
edom on this side of
h is they're scared to
y know that freedom
on't dare leave their
t.

of Soviet tanks that
untryside, the Soviet
er the border, they
se. They're there to
divide the Alliance.
ose of NATO have a
ces have a different
seek to make Europe
p Europe free.

t Germany, through
ve time and again
gether in defense of
and ours. And Presi-
t visit to the U.S.
ion was symbolic of
Europeans support
I, too, as President
giving you what you
I'm determined that
new equipment, top-
best leadership.

by your service. Your
routine, but, believe
f a noble cause, the
d dignity. And you,
re the peacemakers.

what you're doing,
reserve peace, and I
ing to be the goal as
ion is in Washington.
een four wars in my
to see another. I'm

going to tell you a story about one of those
wars, only because it tells the difference
between two societies, ours and that society
the other side of the wall.

It goes back to a war when a B-17
bomber was flying back across the channel
badly shot up by anti-aircraft fire. The ball
turret that hung beneath the belly of the
plane had taken a hit, was jammed. They
couldn't get the ball turret gunner out
while they were flying, and he was wound-
ed. And out over the channel the plane
started to lose altitude. The skipper ordered
bail-out, and as the men started to leave the
plane, the boy in the ball turret knew he
was being left to go down with the plane.
The last man to leave the plane saw the
captain sit down on the floor and take his
hand, and he said, "Never mind son, we'll
ride it down together."

The Congressional Medal of Honor, post-
humously awarded. That citation that I read
when I was serving in that same war stuck
with me for many years and came back to
me just a few years ago when the Soviet
Union gave its highest honor, a gold medal,

to a man, a Spaniard living in Moscow. But
they don't give citations. They don't tell
you why; they just give the medal. So, I did
some digging to find out why he was their
highest honoree. Well, he had spent 8 years
in Cuba before going to Moscow. And
before that he had spent 23 years in Mexico
in prison. He was the man who buried a
pickaxe in the head of—Leon Trotsky's
head. They gave their highest honor for
murder. We gave our highest honor to a
man who had sacrificed his life to comfort a
boy who had to die.

I don't know of anything that explains the
difference between the society we're trying
to preserve and the society we're defending
the world against than that particular story.

God bless you all for what you're doing.

*Note: The President spoke at 9:58 a.m. at
Tempelhof Airport.*

*Following his remarks, the President went
to Checkpoint Charlie, where he viewed the
Berlin Wall. He was accompanied by Chan-
cellor Helmut Schmidt and Berlin Mayor
Richard von Weizsäcker.*

Remarks to the People of Berlin June 11, 1982

Mr. Governing Mayor, Mr. Chancellor,
Excellencies, you ladies and gentlemen:

It was one of Germany's greatest sons,
Goethe, who said that "there is stong
shadow where there is much light." In our
times, Berlin, more than any other place in
the world, is such a meeting place of light
and shadow, tyranny and freedom. To be
here is truly to stand on freedom's edge and
in the shadow of a wall that has come to
symbolize all that is darkest in the world
today, to sense how shining and priceless
and how much in need of constant vigilance
and protection our legacy of liberty is.

This day marks a happy return for us. We
paid our first visit to this great city more
than 3 years ago, as private citizens. As with
every other citizen to Berlin or visitor to
Berlin, I came away with a vivid impression
of a city that is more than a place on the

map—a city that is a testament to what is
both most inspiring and most troubling
about the time we live in.

Thomas Mann once wrote that "A man
lives not only his personal life as an individ-
ual, but also consciously or unconsciously
the life of his epoch." Nowhere is this more
true than in Berlin, where each moment of
everyday life is spent against the backdrop
of contending global systems and ideas. To
be a Berliner is to live the great historic
struggle of this age, the latest chapter in
man's timeless quest for freedom.

As Americans, we understand this. Our
commitment to Berlin is a lasting one.
Thousands of our citizens have served here
since the first small contingent of American
troops arrived on July 4th, 1945, the anni-
versary of our independence as a nation.
Americans have served here ever since—

not as conquerors, but as guardians of the freedom of West Berlin and its brave, proud, people.

Today I want to pay tribute to my fellow countrymen, military and civilian, who serve their country and the people of Berlin and, in so doing, stand as sentinals of freedom everywhere. I also wish to pay my personal respects to the people of this great city. My visit here today is proof that this American commitment has been worthwhile. Our freedom is indivisible.

The American commitment to Berlin is much deeper than our military presence here. In the 37 years since World War II, a succession of American Presidents has made it clear that our role in Berlin is emblematic of our larger search for peace throughout Europe and the world. Ten years ago this month, that search brought into force the Quadripartite Agreement on Berlin. A decade later, West Berliners live more securely, can travel more freely and, most significantly, have more contact with friends and relatives in East Berlin and East Germany than was possible 10 years ago.

These achievements reflect the realistic approach of Allied negotiators, who recognized that practical progress can be made even while basic differences remain between East and West. As a result, both sides have managed to handle their differences in Berlin without the clash of arms, to the benefit of all mankind.

The United States remains committed to the Berlin agreement. We will continue to expect strict observance and full implementation in all aspects of this accord, including those which apply to the eastern sector of Berlin. But if we are heartened by the partial progress achieved in Berlin, other developments make us aware of the growing military power and expansionism of the Soviet Union.

Instead of working with the West to reduce tensions and erase the danger of war, the Soviet Union is engaged in the greatest military buildup in the history of the world. It has used its new-found might to ruthlessly pursue its goals around the world. As the sad case of Afghanistan proves, the Soviet Union has not always respected the precious right of national sovereignty it is committed to uphold as a signa-

tory of the United Nations Charter. And only one day's auto ride from here, in the great city of Warsaw, a courageous people suffer, because they dare to strive for the very fundamental human rights which that Helsinki Final Act proclaimed.

The citizens of free Berlin appreciate better than anyone the importance of allied unity in the face of such challenges. Ten years after the Berlin agreement, the hope it engendered for lasting peace remains a hope rather than a certainty. But the hopes of free people—be they German or American—are stubborn things. We will not be lulled or bullied into fatalism, into resignation. We believe that progress for just and lasting peace can be made, that substantial areas of agreement can be reached with potential adversaries when the forces of freedom act with firmness, unity, and a sincere willingness to negotiate.

To succeed at the negotiating table, we allies have learned that a healthy military balance is a necessity. Yesterday, the other NATO heads of government and I agreed that it is essential to preserve and strengthen such a military balance. And let there be no doubt: The United States will continue to honor its commitment to Berlin.

Our forces will remain here as long as necessary to preserve the peace and protect the freedom of the people of Berlin. For us the American presence in Berlin, as long as it is needed, is not a burden; it is a sacred trust.

Ours is a defensive mission. We pose no threat to those who live on the other side of the wall. But we do extend a challenge, a new Berlin initiative to the leaders of the Soviet bloc. It is a challenge for peace. We challenge the men in the Kremlin to join with us in the quest for peace, security, and a lowering of the tensions and weaponry that could lead to future conflict.

We challenge the Soviet Union, as we proposed last year, to eliminate their SS-20, SS-4, and SS-5 missiles. If Chairman Brezhnev agrees to this, we stand ready to forgo all of our ground-launched cruise missiles and Pershing II missiles.

We challenge the Soviet Union, as NATO proposed yesterday, to slash the conventional ground forces of the Warsaw Pact and

Nations Charter. And ride from here, in the v, a courageous people dare to strive for the man rights which that oclaimed.

free Berlin appreciate he importance of allied f such challenges. Ten n agreement, the hope sting peace remains a ertainty. But the hopes hey German or Ameri-hings. We will not be o fatalism, into resigna-it progress for just and made, that substantial can be reached with s when the forces of mness, unity, and a sin-egotiate.

e negotiating table, we that a healthy military ty. Yesterday, the other vernment and I agreed o preserve and strength-alance. And let there be ed States will continue ment to Berlin.

remain here as long as e the peace and protect people of Berlin. For us nce in Berlin, as long as a burden; it is a sacred

ve mission. We pose no live on the other side of o extend a challenge, a e to the leaders of the challenge for peace. We in the Kremlin to join for peace, security, and tensions and weaponry ture conflict.

o Soviet Union, as we o eliminate their SS-20, les. If Chairman Brezh-ve stand ready to forgo aunched cruise missiles.

Soviet Union, as NATO o slash the convention- f the Warsaw Pact and

NATO in Central Europe to 700,000 men each and the total ground and air forces of the two alliances to 900,000 men each. And we challenge the Soviet Union to live up to its signature its leader placed on the Helsinki treaty, so that the basic human rights of Soviet and Eastern Europe people will be respected.

A positive response to these sincere and reasonable points from the Soviets, these calls for conciliation instead of confrontation, could open the door for a conference on disarmament in Europe.

We Americans—we Americans are optimists, but we are also realists. We're a peaceful people, but we're not a weak or gullible people. So, we look with hope to the Soviet Union's response. But we expect positive actions rather than rhetoric as the first proof of Soviet good intentions. We expect that the response to my Berlin initiative for peace will demonstrate finally that the Soviet Union is serious about working to reduce tensions in other parts of the world as they have been able to do here in Berlin.

Peace, it has been said, is more than the absence of armed conflict. Reducing military forces alone will not automatically guarantee the long-term prospects for peace.

Several times in the 1950's and '60's the world went to the brink of war over Berlin. Those confrontations did not come because of military forces or operations alone. They arose because the Soviet Union refused to allow the free flow of peoples and ideas between East and West. And they came because the Soviet authorities and their minions repressed millions of citizens in Eastern Germany who did not wish to live under a Communist dictatorship.

So, I want to concentrate the second part of America's new Berlin initiative on ways to reduce the human barriers—barriers as bleak and brutal as the Berlin Wall itself—which divide Europe today.

If I had only one message to urge on the leaders of the Soviet bloc, it would be this: Think of your own coming generations. Look with me 10 years into the future when we will celebrate the 20th anniversary of the Berlin agreement. What then will be the fruits of our efforts? Do the Soviet leaders want to be remembered for a prison

wall, ringed with barbed wire and armed guards whose weapons are aimed at innocent civilians—their own civilians? Do they want to conduct themselves in a way that will earn only the contempt of free peoples and the distrust of their own citizens? Or do they want to be remembered for having taken up our offer to use Berlin as a starting point for true efforts to reduce the human and political divisions which are the ultimate cause of every war?

We in the West have made our choice. America and our allies welcome peaceful competition in ideas, in economics, and in all facets of human activity. We seek no advantage. We covet no territory. And we wish to force no ideology or way of life on others.

The time has come, 10 years after the Berlin agreement, to fulfill the promise it seemed to offer at its dawn. I call on President Brezhnev to join me in a sincere effort to translate the dashed hopes of the 1970's into the reality of a safer and freer Europe in the 1980's.

I am determined to assure that our civilization averts the catastrophe of a nuclear war. Stability depends primarily on the maintenance of a military balance which offers no temptation to an aggressor. And the arms control proposals which I have made are designed to enhance deterrence and achieve stability at substantially lower and equal force levels. At the same time, other measures might be negotiated between the United States and the Soviet Union to reinforce the peace and help reduce the possibility of a nuclear conflict. These include measures to enhance mutual confidence and to improve communication both in time of peace and in a crisis.

Past agreements have created the hot line between Moscow and Washington, established measures to reduce the danger of nuclear accidents, and provided for notification of some missile launches. We are now studying other concrete and practical steps to help further reduce the risk of a nuclear conflict which I intend to explore with the Soviet Union. It is time we went further to avert the risk of war through accident or misunderstanding.

We shortly will approach the Soviet

Union with proposals in such areas as notification of strategic exercises, of missile launches, and expanded exchange of strategic forces data. Taken together, these steps would represent a qualitative improvement in the nuclear environment. They would help reduce the chances of misinterpretation in the case of exercises and test launches. And they would reduce the secrecy and ambiguity which surround military activity. We are considering additional measures as well.

We will be making these proposals in good faith to the Soviet Union. We hope that their response to this Berlin initiative, so appropriate to a city that is acutely conscious of the costs and risks of war, will be positive. A united, resolute Western Alliance stands ready to defend itself if necessary. But we are also ready to work with the Soviet bloc in peaceful cooperation if the leaders of the East are willing to respond in kind.

Let them remember the message of Schiller that only "He who has done his best for his own time has lived for all times." Let them join with us in our time to achieve a lasting peace and a better life for tomorrow's generations on both sides of that blighted wall. And let the Brandenburg Gate become a symbol not of two separate and hostile worlds, but an open door through which ideas, free ideas, and peaceful competition flourish.

My final message is for the people of Berlin. Even before my first visit to your city, I felt a part of you, as all free men and women around the world do. We lived through the blockade and airlift with you.

We witnessed the heroic reconstruction of a devastated city, and we watched the creation of your strong democratic institutions.

When I came here in 1978, I was deeply moved and proud of your success. What finer proof of what freedom can accomplish than the vibrant, prosperous island you've created in the midst of a hostile sea. Today, my reverence for your courage and accomplishment has grown even deeper.

You are a constant inspiration for us all—for our hopes and ideals, and for the human qualities of courage, endurance, and faith that are the one secret weapon of the West no totalitarian regime can ever match. As long as Berlin exists, there can be no doubt about the hope for democracy.

Yes, the hated wall still stands. But taller and stronger than that bleak barrier dividing East from West, free from oppressed, stands the character of the Berliners themselves. You have endured in your splendid city on the Spree, and my return visit has convinced me, in the words of the beloved old song that "*Berlin bleibt doch Berlin*" — Berlin is still Berlin.

We all remember John Kennedy's stirring words when he visited Berlin. I can only add that we in America and in the West are still Berliners, too, and always will be. And I am proud to say today that it is good to be home again.

God bless you. *Danke schön.*

Note: The President spoke at 11:35 a.m. in front of the Charlottenburg Palace.

During his appearance at Charlottenburg Palace, the President attended a reception hosted by Berlin Mayor Richard von Weizsäcker.

Remarks on Departure From Bonn, Federal Republic of Germany June 11, 1982

Chancellor Schmidt, Herr Genscher, Excellencies who are here on the platform and you ladies and gentlemen:

Nancy and I are grateful for the warmth and the friendship that we have encountered throughout our short visits to Bonn and Berlin.

In Berlin this morning I looked across that tragic wall and saw the grim consequences of freedom denied. But I was deeply inspired by the courage and dedication to liberty which I saw in so many faces on the western side of that city.

cities—and all the people of this area—can share.

Two points should be made about the transfer of the property. First, the exact acreage to be transferred for the airport has not been determined, but it will include whatever is necessary for safe, efficient operations, the needs of the community, and the Nation's airspace system. Second, my administration has initiated a policy of seeking fair-market value when we dispose of surplus Federal property. Our Federal property is a capital asset, and we must improve our management of it. Last February, I signed an Executive order that will help meet this goal by establishing a Property Review Board at the White House to oversee Federal property sales. To under-

score our commitment, the members of this Board include several of my senior advisers. We intend to take the proceeds from property sales and place them in a special account in the Treasury—an account that will be used exclusively to offset the national debt. Thus, we will be looking for buyers for the remaining parts of the property that are not needed for the airport.

Houston has a proud past and a bright future. Aviation has long been a part of the growth and development of this great State and this magnificent, dynamic city. The new general aviation airport to be situated here will enable more people to fly to the Houston area for business and for pleasure, and to enjoy all that the area has to offer.

Message to the Senate Transmitting the United States-China Agreement on Taxation of Transportation Income

June 16, 1982

To the Senate of the United States:

I transmit herewith, for Senate advice and consent to ratification, an Agreement between the Government of the United States of America and the Government of the People's Republic of China with respect to mutual exemption from taxation of transportation income of shipping and air transport enterprises, signed at Beijing on March 5, 1982. I also transmit the report of the Department of State on the Agreement.

Under the Agreement, United States enterprises will be exempt from Chinese income taxes and Chinese enterprises will be exempt from United States Federal income tax on income derived from the op-

eration of ships and aircraft in international traffic. The exempt income includes income from the leasing of ships, aircraft and containers used in international traffic.

As with other treaties of this kind, the provisions of the Agreement do not affect the United States taxation of residents and citizens of the United States, or China's taxation of its residents and citizens.

I recommend that the Senate give early and favorable consideration to the Agreement and give advice and consent to its ratification.

RONALD REAGAN

The White House,
June 16, 1982.

Remarks in New York City Before the United Nations General Assembly Special Session Devoted to Disarmament

June 17, 1982

Mr. Secretary-General, Mr. President, distinguished delegates, ladies and gentlemen:

I speak today as both a citizen of the United States and of the world. I come with

cities—and all the people of this area—can share.

Two points should be made about the transfer of the property. First, the exact acreage to be transferred for the airport has not been determined, but it will include whatever is necessary for safe, efficient operations, the needs of the community, and the Nation's airspace system. Second, my administration has initiated a policy of seeking fair-market value when we dispose of surplus Federal property. Our Federal property is a capital asset, and we must improve our management of it. Last February, I signed an Executive order that will help meet this goal by establishing a Property Review Board at the White House to oversee Federal property sales. To under-

score our commitment, the members of this Board include several of my senior advisers. We intend to take the proceeds from property sales and place them in a special account in the Treasury—an account that will be used exclusively to offset the national debt. Thus, we will be looking for buyers for the remaining parts of the property that are not needed for the airport.

Houston has a proud past and a bright future. Aviation has long been a part of the growth and development of this great State and this magnificent, dynamic city. The new general aviation airport to be situated here will enable more people to fly to the Houston area for business and for pleasure, and to enjoy all that the area has to offer.

Message to the Senate Transmitting the United States-China Agreement on Taxation of Transportation Income

June 16, 1982

To the Senate of the United States:

I transmit herewith, for Senate advice and consent to ratification, an Agreement between the Government of the United States of America and the Government of the People's Republic of China with respect to mutual exemption from taxation of transportation income of shipping and air transport enterprises, signed at Beijing on March 5, 1982. I also transmit the report of the Department of State on the Agreement.

Under the Agreement, United States enterprises will be exempt from Chinese income taxes and Chinese enterprises will be exempt from United States Federal income tax on income derived from the op-

eration of ships and aircraft in international traffic. The exempt income includes income from the leasing of ships, aircraft and containers used in international traffic.

As with other treaties of this kind, the provisions of the Agreement do not affect the United States taxation of residents and citizens of the United States, or China's taxation of its residents and citizens.

I recommend that the Senate give early and favorable consideration to the Agreement and give advice and consent to its ratification.

RONALD REAGAN

The White House,
June 16, 1982.

Remarks in New York City Before the United Nations General Assembly Special Session Devoted to Disarmament

June 17, 1982

Mr. Secretary-General, Mr. President, distinguished delegates, ladies and gentlemen:

I speak today as both a citizen of the United States and of the world. I come with

are in deep contrast to

and a bitter lesson in this
of tyranny cannot be
done. So, we have em-
to renew our strength
ously low. We refuse
hile potential adversar-
d to their imperialist

ent me here today to
citizens of the world,
for we Americans are
ationality represented
v. We understand that
every race and creed
together for peace. We
the next steps down the
rough verifiable arms

is control and disarm-
in reinforcing peace;
s. We should not con-
agreements with the
s. Simply collecting
bring peace. Agree-
orce peace only when
wise we're building a
be blown away by the

ve need deeds, not
is of Soviet sincerity,
join us on this path.
World War II, the
the leader in serious
s control proposals. In
known as the Baruch
s submitted a propos-
r weapons and nucle-
ational authority. The
an. In 1955 President
"Open Skies" propos-
nited States and the
ive exchanged blue-
blishments and pro-
aissance. The Soviets

d Test Ban Treaty
reaty ended nuclear
e atmosphere, outer
by participating na-
ty on the Non-Prolif-
eapons took effect.

The United States played a major role in this key effort to prevent the spread of nuclear explosives and to provide for international safeguards on civil nuclear activities.

My country remains deeply committed to those objectives today, and to strengthening the nonproliferation framework. This is essential to international security. In the early 1970's, again at United States urging, agreements were reached between the United States and the U.S.S.R. providing for ceilings on some categories of weapons. They could have been more meaningful if Soviet actions had shown restraint and commitment to stability at lower levels of force.

The United Nations designated the 1970's as the First Disarmament Decade. But good intentions were not enough. In reality that 10-year period included an unprecedented buildup in military weapons and the flaring of aggression and use of force in almost every region of the world. We are now in the Second Disarmament Decade. The task at hand is to assure civilized behavior among nations, to unite behind an agenda of peace.

Over the past 7 months, the United States has put forward a broad-based, comprehensive series of proposals to reduce the risk of war. We have proposed four major points as an agenda for peace: elimination of land-based, intermediate-range missiles; a one-third reduction in strategic ballistic missile warheads; a substantial reduction in NATO and Warsaw Pact ground and air forces; and new safeguards to reduce the risk of accidental war. We urge the Soviet Union today to join with us in this quest. We must act not for ourselves alone, but for all mankind.

On November 18th of last year, I announced United States objectives in arms control agreements. They must be equitable and militarily significant. They must stabilize forces at lower levels, and they must be verifiable. The United States and its allies have made specific, reasonable, and equitable proposals.

In February, our negotiating team in Geneva offered the Soviet Union a draft treaty on intermediate-range nuclear forces. We offered to cancel deployment of our Pershing II ballistic missiles and ground-launched cruise missiles in exchange for Soviet elimination of the SS-20, SS-4, and

SS-5 missiles. This proposal would eliminate with one stroke those systems about which both sides have expressed the greatest concern.

The United States is also looking forward to beginning negotiations on strategic arms reductions with the Soviet Union in less than 2 weeks. We will work hard to make these talks an opportunity for real progress in our quest for peace.

On May 9th I announced a phased approach to the reduction of strategic arms. In a first phase, the number of ballistic missile warheads on each side would be reduced to about 5,000. No more than half the remaining warheads would be on land-based missiles. All ballistic missiles would be reduced to an equal level, at about one-half the current United States number. In the second phase, we would reduce each side's overall destructive power to equal levels, including a mutual ceiling on ballistic missile throw-weight below the current U.S. level. We are also prepared to discuss other elements of the strategic balance.

Before I returned from Europe last week, I met in Bonn with the leaders of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization. We agreed to introduce a major new Western initiative for the Vienna negotiations on Mutual Balanced Force Reductions. Our approach calls for common, collective ceilings for both NATO and the Warsaw Treaty Organization. After 7 years, there would be a total of 700,000 ground forces and 900,000 ground and air force personnel combined. It also includes a package of associated measures to encourage cooperation and verify compliance.

We urge the Soviet Union and members of the Warsaw Pact to view our Western proposal as a means to reach agreement in Vienna after 9 long years of inconclusive talks. We also urge them to implement the 1975 Helsinki agreement on security and cooperation in Europe.

Let me stress that for agreements to work, both sides must be able to verify compliance. The building of mutual confidence in compliance can only be achieved through greater openness. I encourage the special session on disarmament to endorse the importance of these principles in arms

LEVEL 1 - 29 OF 29 DOCUMENTS

Public Papers of the Presidents

London, England

Address to Members of Parliament.

18 Weekly Comp. Pres. Doc. 764

June 8, 1982

LENGTH: 4488 words



... will leave Marxism-Leninism on the ashheap of history as it has left other tyrannies which stifle the freedom and muzzle the self-expression of the people. And that's why we must continue our efforts to strengthen NATO even as we move forward with our the negotiations on intermediate-range forces and our proposal for a one-third reduction in strategic ballistic missile warheads.

Our military strength is a prerequisite to peace, but let ...

LEVEL 1 - 28 OF 29 DOCUMENTS

Public Papers of the Presidents

The President's News Conference of November 11, 1982

18 Weekly Comp. Pres. Doc. 1457

November 11, 1982

LENGTH: 5219 words

... all of the these things are in the works, and that's why we have three teams negotiating -- one on the matter of conventional arms, one on the matter of strategic missiles, and the other on the matter of the INF [Intermediate-range Nuclear force]. announced a year

But I tell you what I'd rather ask you to do and wait for is in the very near future I am going to be speaking in a major address on that ...

Nov. 18, 1981 - National Press Club
Building - address live TV.

Feb 8, 1982 - Bloomington, MN

Feb 9, 1982 Des Moines, Iowa

March 15, 1982 Nashville, TN

March 16, 1982 - Oklahoma City, Okl.

May 9, 1982 - Eureka College Commencement

May 10, 1982 - Chicago Ill. H.S.

QA Rose Garden April 26, 1982 mention Grand Zero
Berlin 1ST Time

London June 8, 1982 Zero Option 1ST Time

• Bonn June 9, 1982

Berlin June 11, 1982

UNGA NY City June 17, 1982

Where 1ST speech given on zero-zero option ('81-on)

cities - location - event venues
Berlin '82 / Late '81

6/3 - 6/10 1982 Berlin Speech

Remarks to Members of the National Press Club on Arms
Reduction + Nuclear Weapons Nov. 18, 1981

June 8, 1982 - Parliament in London
Strengthen NATO as zero-zero option

Nov. 18, 1981 - START

Aug 13, 1981 - Q+A Economic Recovery Act
arms reduction of strategic arms reduction

1982 - Rm. 308