

Ronald Reagan Presidential Library
Digital Library Collections

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

Collection: Speechwriting, White House Office of:
Research Office, 1981-1989

Folder Title: 11/14/1985 Address to the Nation re
Geneva Summit (2)

Box: 241

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>

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

(NSC redraft)
November 13, 1985
2:00 p.m.

PRESIDENTIAL ADDRESS TO THE NATION ON THE GENEVA SUMMIT
THURSDAY, NOVEMBER 14, 1985

My fellow Americans. Good evening. In 48 hours, I will be leaving for Geneva for the first meeting between an American President and a Soviet leader in 6 years. I know that you and the people of the world are looking forward to that meeting with great interest, so tonight I want to share with you my hopes and to tell you why I am going to Geneva.

My mission, stated simply, is a mission for peace. It is to engage the new Soviet leader in what I hope will be a dialogue for peace that endures beyond my Presidency. It is to sit down across from Mr. Gorbachev and try to map out, together, a basis for peaceful discourse even though our disagreements on fundamentals will not change.

It is my fervent hope that the two of us can begin a process which our successors and our peoples can continue: facing our differences frankly and openly and beginning to narrow and resolve them; communicating effectively so that our actions and intentions are not misunderstood; and eliminating the barriers between us and cooperating wherever possible for the greater good of all.

This meeting can be an historic opportunity to set a steady, more constructive course through the 21st century.

The history of American-Soviet relations, however, does not augur well for euphoria. Eight of my predecessors -- each in his own way in his own time -- sought to achieve a more stable and

peaceful relationship with the Soviet Union. None fully succeeded. So I don't underestimate the difficulty of the task ahead. But these sad chapters do not relieve me of the obligation to try to make this a safer, better world. For our children, our grandchildren, for all mankind -- I intend to make the effort. And it is with your prayers, and God's help, I hope to succeed.

Success at the summit, however, should not be measured by any short-term agreements that may be signed. Only the passage of time will tell us whether we constructed a durable bridge to a safer world.

This, then, is why I go to Geneva. To build a foundation for lasting peace.

When we speak of peace, we should not mean just the absence of war. True peace rests on the pillars of individual freedom, human rights, national self-determination, and respect for the rule of law. Building a safer future requires that we address candidly all the issues which divide us, and not just focus on one or two issues, important as they may be. When we meet in Geneva, our agenda will seek not just to avoid war, but to strengthen peace, prevent confrontation, and remove the sources of tension. We should seek to reduce the suspicions and mistrust that have led us to acquire mountains of strategic weapons.

Since the dawn of the nuclear age, every American President has sought to limit and end the dangerous competition in nuclear arms. I have no higher priority than to finally realize that

dream. I've said before, and will say again, a nuclear war cannot be won and must never be fought.

We have gone the extra mile in arms control, but our offers have not always been welcome.

In 1977, and again in 1981, the United States proposed to the Soviet Union deep reciprocal cuts in strategic forces. These offers were rejected, out-of-hand. The following year, we proposed the complete elimination of a whole category of intermediate range nuclear forces. Two years later we proposed a treaty for a global ban on chemical weapons. In 1983, the Soviet Union got up and walked out of the Geneva arms control negotiations altogether. They did this in protest because we and our European allies had begun to deploy nuclear weapons as a counter to Soviet SS-20's aimed at European cities.

I am pleased now, however, with the interest expressed in reducing offensive weapons by the new Soviet leadership. Let me repeat tonight what I announced last week: the United States is prepared to reduce comparable nuclear weapons by 50 percent. We seek reductions that would result in a stable balance between us -- with no first strike capability -- and full compliance.

If we both reduce the weapons of war there would be no losers, only winners. And the whole world would benefit if we could both abandon these weapons altogether and move to non-nuclear defensive systems which threaten no one.

The United States has begun research and testing on new defense technologies that can make the world safer. We seek to develop a security shield that would protect people by preventing

weapons from reaching their targets, and that, hopefully, might one day render these awesome weapons of destruction obsolete.

The Soviet Union has been conducting long-standing and extensive research on its own defensive systems. How much better for all mankind if we and the Soviets, together, could find a way out of the prison of mutual terror in which both our nations have been confined since the advent of the atomic age.

How much better if we could come together and work for a future in which we relied less and less on destructive, offensive systems, and more and more on defensive systems that threaten no one.

But nuclear arms control is not of itself a final answer. As I reminded the editors of Pravda and Izvestia 2 weeks ago: nations do not distrust each other because they are armed. They arm themselves because they distrust each other. The use of force, subversion, and terror ~~that~~ has made the world a more dangerous place.

Thus, today, there is no peace in Afghanistan; no peace in Cambodia; no peace in Angola, Ethiopia, or Nicaragua. These wars have claimed hundreds of thousands of lives and threaten to spill over national frontiers.

That is why in my address to the United Nations I proposed a way to end these conflicts, a regional peace plan that calls for -- ceasefires, negotiations among the warring parties, withdrawal of all foreign troops, democratic reconciliation, and economic assistance.

Four times in my lifetime our soldiers have been sent overseas to fight in foreign lands. Their remains can be found from Flanders Fields to the islands of the ~~Western~~ Pacific. Not once were those young men sent abroad in the cause of conquest. Not once did they come home claiming a single square inch of some other country as a trophy of war.

A great danger in the past, however, has been the failure by our enemies to remember that while we Americans detest war, we love freedom -- and stand ready to sacrifice for it, as we have done four times in my lifetime.

In advancing freedom we Americans carry a special burden. A belief in the dignity of man in the sight of the God Who gave birth to this country. It is central to our being. A century-and-a-half ago, Thomas Jefferson told the world, "The mass of mankind has not been born with saddles on their backs." Freedom is America's core. We must never deny it, nor forsake it. Should the day come when we Americans remain silent in the face of armed aggression, then the cause of America -- the cause of freedom -- will have been lost, and the great heart of this country will have been broken.

This affirmation of freedom is not only our duty as Americans, it is essential for success at Geneva.

Freedom and democracy are the best guarantors of peace. History has shown that democratic nations do not start wars. Rights of the individual and the rule of law ^{is} as fundamental to peace as arms control. A government which does not respect its citizens' rights and its international commitments to protect

those rights is not likely to respect its other international undertakings.

That is why we must and will speak in Geneva on behalf of those who cannot speak for themselves. We are not trying to impose our beliefs on others. We have a right to expect, however, that great states will live up to their international obligations.

Despite our deep and abiding differences we can and must prevent our international competition from spilling over into violence. We can find as yet undiscovered avenues where American and Soviet citizens can cooperate, fruitfully, for the benefit of mankind. And this, too, is why I am going to Geneva.

Enduring peace requires openness, honest communications, and opportunities for our peoples to get to know one another directly.

The U.S. has always stood for openness. Thirty years ago in Geneva, President Eisenhower, preparing for his first meeting with the then Soviet leader, made his Open Skies proposal and an offer of new educational and cultural exchanges with the Soviet Union. He recognized that removing the barriers between people is at the heart of our relationship. He said:

"Restrictions on communications of all kinds, including radio and travel, existing in extreme form in some places, have operated as causes of mutual distrust. In America, the fervent belief in freedom of thought, of expression, and of movement is a vital part of our heritage."

I have hopes that we can lessen the distrust between us, reduce the levels of secrecy, and bring forth a more "Open World." Imagine how much good we could accomplish, how the cause of peace would be served, if more individuals and families from our respective countries could come to know each other in a personal way.

For example, if Soviet youth could attend American schools and universities, they could learn first-hand what spirit of freedom rules our land, and that we do not wish the Soviet people any harm. If American youth could do likewise, they could talk about their interests and values and hopes for the future with their Soviet friends. They would get first-hand knowledge of life in the U.S.S.R., but most important they would learn that we are all God's children with much in common.

Imagine if people in Minneapolis could see the ^{Bolshoi} ~~the Bolshoi~~ live, while citizens in ^{Tashkent} ~~Mkhatchkala~~ could see an American play or hear ^{the Beach Boys} Count Basie's band. And how about Soviet children watching Sesame Street? X

We have had educational and cultural exchanges for 25 years, and are now close to completing a new agreement. But I feel the time is ripe for us to take bold new steps to open the way for our peoples to participate in an unprecedented way in the building of peace. Why shouldn't I propose to Mr. Gorbachev at Geneva that we exchange thousands of our citizens from fraternal, religious, educational, and cultural groups?

Why not suggest the exchange of thousands of undergraduates each year, and high school students who would live with a host

family and attend schools or summer camps? We could look to increase scholarship programs, improve language studies, conduct courses in history, culture, and other subjects, develop new sister cities, establish libraries and cultural centers, and, yes, increase athletic competitions.

People of both our nations love sports. If we must compete, let it be on the playing fields and not the battlefields.

In science and technology we could launch new joint space flights and establish joint medical research projects. In communications, we would like to see more appearances in the other's mass media by representatives of both our countries: if Soviet spokesmen are free to appear on American television, to be published and read in the American press, shouldn't the Soviet peoples have the same right to see, hear, and read what we Americans have to say?

Such proposals will not bridge our differences, but people-to-people contacts can build genuine constituencies for peace in both countries. After all, people don't start wars, governments do.

Let me summarize, then, the vision and hopes that we carry with us to Geneva.

We go with an appreciation, born of experience, of the deep differences between us -- between our values, our systems, our beliefs. But we also carry with us the determination not to permit those differences to erupt into confrontation or conflict.

We don't like each other's governmental systems, but we are not out to change theirs, and we will not permit them to change ours. [We do not threaten the Soviet people and never will.]

We go without illusion, but with hope -- hope that progress can be made on our entire agenda.

We believe that progress can be made in resolving the regional conflicts burning now on three continents -- including in this hemisphere. The regional plan we enunciated at the United Nations will be raised again at Geneva.

We are proposing the broadest people-to-people exchanges in the history of American-Soviet relations, exchanges in sports and culture, in the media, education, and the arts. Such exchanges can build in our societies thousands of coalitions for cooperation and peace.

Governments can only do so much: once they get the ball rolling, they should step out of the way and let people get together to share, enjoy, help, listen and learn from each other, especially young people.

Finally, we go to Geneva with the sober realization that nuclear weapons pose the greatest threat in human history to the survival of the human race, that the arms race must be stopped. We go determined to search out, and discover, common ground -- where we can agree to begin the reduction, looking to the eventual elimination, of nuclear weapons from the face of the Earth.

It is not an impossible dream that we can begin to reduce nuclear arsenals, reduce the risk of war, and build a solid

foundation for peace. It is not an impossible dream that our children and grandchildren can some day travel freely back and forth between America and the Soviet Union, visit each other's homes, work and study together, enjoy and discuss plays, music, television, and root for teams when they compete.

These, then, are the indispensable elements of a true peace: the steady expansion of human rights for all the world's peoples; support for resolving conflicts in Asia, Africa, and Latin America that carry the seeds of a wider war; a broadening of people-to-people exchanges that can diminish the distrust and suspicion that separate our two peoples. Lastly, the steady reduction of these awesome nuclear arsenals -- until they no longer threaten the world we both must inhabit. This is our agenda for Geneva; this is our policy; this is our plan for peace.

We have cooperated in the past. In both world wars, Americans and Russians fought on separate fronts against a common enemy. Near the ~~city~~ ^{city} of Murmansk, sons of our own nation are buried, heroes who died of wounds sustained on the treacherous North Atlantic and North Sea convoys that carried to Russia the indispensable tools of survival and victory.

So, while it would be naive to think a single summit can establish a permanent peace, this conference can begin a dialogue for peace.

So we look to the future with optimism, and we go to Geneva with confidence.

Both Nancy and I are grateful for the chance you have given us to serve this nation and the trust you have placed in us. I know how deep the hope of peace is in her heart, as it is in the heart of every American and Russian mother.

I received a letter and picture from one such mother in Louisiana recently. She wrote, Mr. President, How could anyone be more blessed than I? These children you see enclosed in this envelope are mine, granted to me by the Lord for a short time.... When you go to Geneva, please remember these faces...remember the faces of my children, of Jonathan (my son), and of my twins, Lara (from Dr. Zhivago -- a Russian story) and Jessica. Their future may depend on your actions. I will pray for guidance for you and the Soviet leaders.

Her words, my children, read like a declaration of love. I could only think, how that cry has echoed down through the centuries, a cry for the children of the world, for peace, for love of fellowman.

Here is the central truth of our time, of any time, a truth to which I have tried to bear witness in this office.

When I first accepted the nomination of my party, I asked you, the American people, to join with me in prayer for our nation and the world. Six days ago, in the Cabinet Room, religious leaders from across our country -- Russian and Greek Orthodox bishops, Catholic Cardinals and Protestant pastors, Mormon elders and Jewish Rabbis, together made of me a similar request.

Tonight, I am honoring that request. I am asking you, my fellow Americans, to pray for God's grace and His guidance -- for all of us -- at Geneva, so that the cause of true peace among men will be advanced and all of humanity thereby served.

WHITE HOUSE STAFFING MEMORANDUM

DATE: 11/6/85 ACTION/CONCURRENCE/COMMENT DUE BY: 4:00 P.M. TODAY

REVISED

SUBJECT: ADDRESS TO THE NATION: GENEVA SUMMIT
(11/6 - 2:15 a.m. draft)

	ACTION FYI			ACTION FYI	
VICE PRESIDENT	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	OGLESBY	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
REGAN	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>			
MILLER	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	RYAN	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
BUCHANAN	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	SPEAKES	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
CHAVEZ	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	SPRINKEL	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
CHEW	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	SVAHN	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
DANIELS	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	THOMAS	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
FIELDING	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	TUTTLE	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
HENKEL	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	ELLIOTT	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
HICKS	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	_____	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
KINGON	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	_____	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
LACY	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	_____	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
McFARLANE	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	_____	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

REMARKS:

please provide your comments directly to Ben Elliott by 4:00 p.m. today with an information copy to my office.

Thank you.

RESPONSE:

(Dolan/Buchanan/Elliott)
November 6, 1985
2:15 a.m.

PRESIDENTIAL ADDRESS TO THE NATION: GENEVA SUMMIT
THURSDAY, NOVEMBER 14, 1985

My fellow Americans. Good evening. In 48 hours, I will be leaving to meet Mr. Gorbachev, the leader of the Soviet Union. It will be the first summit between an American President and a Soviet General Secretary in more than six years. So, I thought it my duty tonight to tell you why I am going to Geneva.

My mission, stated simply, is a mission for peace. It is to engage the new Soviet leader in what I hope will be a dialogue for peace that endures as long as my Presidency. It is to sit down across from Mr. Gorbachev and try to map, together, a common causeway over the no-man's land of suspicion and mistrust and hostility that separates our societies and nations.

I do not -- and you should not, my fellow Americans -- over-estimate the prospects for a great success at the Geneva summit. The history of American-Soviet relations does not argue well for euphoria. Eight of my predecessors -- each in his own way and in his own time -- sought to achieve a more stable and peaceful relationship with the Soviet Union. None fully succeeded. I do not under-estimate the difficulty of the task. But that sad and tragic record does not relieve me of the obligation to use the years allotted by my countrymen, and the powers and capacities God has given me, to try to make ours a safer and more secure world. For ourselves, our children, our grandchildren, for all mankind -- I intend to make that effort.

FOR THE
FORD
NIXON
EAGAN
KENNEDY
CARTER
TRUMAN
F. ROOSEVELT
(HOOVER)

Presidential Documents, 1985-
Oct. 24, 1985 -
Address before 40th
Session of the General
Assembly, p. 1293

For, as I said at the United Nations, peace is God's Commandment; peace is God's will.

You know, in my long lifetime, which exceeds that of almost all of you listening out there, we Americans have created a miracle on this continent. We have built as great and mighty and rich and flourishing a nation as the world has ever seen. And we take pride in what we have built.

Yet, much of what it has taken us all most of a lifetime to build could be shattered and destroyed in half an hour in a nuclear exchange with the Soviet Union. The danger of (thermonuclear) war and the havoc it would wreak, as President Kennedy put it, remains a modern sword of Damocles hanging over all of us. The awful reality of these weapons is a kind of terrible crescendo to the steady, dehumanizing progress of warfare in this century.

N.S.C.
Public Papers of the President - Sept. 25, 1961
Address to 4th General Assembly

To a few people here in this office, I recently recalled a hotly debated issue in my college years. Some of us strenuously argued that in the advent of another world war no civilized person, and certainly no American, would ever obey an order to bomb civilian targets. Humanity, we were certain, would never come to that. Well, World War II and ^{ten of millions of} ~~34 million~~ civilian casualties later we were all sadly, tragically wiser. Today, we have no such illusions. We know if World War III ever breaks out, civilian casualties could reach ^{most} ~~50~~ percent of the population.

To occupy this office is to live with that reality every day. Whenever I travel I am followed by a military aide who

Judith Wandell
R3595

FEMA

N.S.C.

carries a small black attache case -- "the football" is its nickname. It is a grim reminder of the narrow line our world walks every day. It contains the codes necessary for retaliation to a nuclear attack on the United States. And I am sure a young Russian officer walks next to Mr. Gorbachev -- with the same assignment.

This, then, is why I go to Geneva. For peace. In the hope of never having to face the awful option of nuclear retaliation. In the hope of never having again to speak to the parents or wives of American servicemen killed in some military engagement or terrorist attack -- as I did at the time of Grenada and at the time of Beirut.

The full agenda for the summit has now been set down by Secretary Shultz and Foreign Minister Shervarnadze.

We hope to make at least some progress with the Soviet leadership, on the four fronts of our agreed-upon agenda: First, reducing the danger of nuclear confrontation and the stockpiles of nuclear weapons. Second, resolving those regional conflicts in Asia, Africa and Central America that carry the seeds of a wider war. Third, inaugurating an unprecedented series of people-to-people exchanges. Fourth, I intend to engage Mr. Gorbachev directly on the question of Soviet violations of human rights guaranteed in the Helsinki Accords -- those fundamental, God-given rights without which the prospects for peace are always tenuous at best.

Even as we talk about peace, we must remember its indispensable elements. If peace were merely the absence of

military conflict, then there has been peace between the United States and the Soviet Union for the seven decades of our common history.

But that, as we know, is neither an accurate nor full accounting of our relationship.

For our part, we Americans believe that true peace must rest upon the pillars of individual freedom, human rights and national self-determination. Free and democratic peoples do not go to war against one another in the twentieth century. Peace also depends upon a respect for the rule of law and the sanctity of contract.

Nations that have broken one treaty after another -- whether on nuclear arms or chemical weapons or human rights -- should expect to be treated with skepticism when they insist that a new disarmament agreement remains the sum of their international ambitions. Great powers that wage wars of imperial aggression against defenseless neighbors to their south and elsewhere when they profess their intentions are only benign and peaceful toward better-armed neighbors to the West.

In forthrightly opposing such actions we Americans carry a special burden. A belief in the dignity and worth of every individual in the sight of God gave birth to this country. It is central to our being. As Thomas Jefferson wrote: "Man was born with saddles on their backs." Freedom is America's core. We must never deny nor forsake it. Should the day ever come when we remain silent in the face of aggression then the cause of America -- the cause of freedom -- has been lost, and the great heart of this country will have been broken.

Soviet Non-Compliance with Arms Control Agreements; Feb. 1, 1985 - US Dept. of State; Special Report No. 122
USSR violated Helsinki Final Act; the Geneva Protocol on Chemical Weapons; the Biological and Toxin Weapons Convention; 2 provisions of SALT II - also 9 BM Treaty; limited Test Ban Treaty

ok per SUREN KRAEMER NJC K5810

Thomas Jefferson has not been born to wear saddles on their backs. To Russell, vol. 2 Ed. John P. Foley; Russell, NY, 1967, p. 502

This, then, is the second reason I go to Geneva. For freedom. To speak for the right of every people and every nation to choose their own future, for the right of human beings everywhere to determine their own destiny, to live in the dignity God intended for each of his children.

Not only is this affirmation of freedom our responsibility as Americans, it is essential for success in Geneva. If history has shown there is any key to dealing successfully with the Soviets it is this: The Soviets must realize that we harbor no illusions about their ultimate goals and intentions. The Soviet mind is not the mirror image of the American or the Western mind.

The Soviets have a very different view of the world. They believe a great struggle is underway and true peace can only be attained with the final triumph of communist power. They believe the march of history is embodied in the Soviet state. So, to them, the continued existence of the great democracies is seen as an obstacle to the ultimate triumph of history and that state.

So I must also be blunt tonight. I go to Geneva for peace and freedom, but without illusions. The fact of this summit conference does not mean the Soviets have forsaken their long-term goals. President Eisenhower's somber warning in his farewell address unfortunately still rings true: "we face a hostile ideology -- global in scope, atheistic in character, ruthless in purpose, and insidious in method."

I do not mean, however, to sound unduly pessimistic. While it would be foolhardy to think one summit conference can

meeting

*NSC
Mottlock*

*Public Papers
of the President
JAN. 17, 1961, p. 455
"Farewell" Radio and
Television Address to
the American People"*

*ok per
SVEN KRAEMER
NSC x 5010*

X

X

X

X

establish a permanent peace, this conference can begin a permanent dialogue for peace.

My fellow Americans, there is cause for hope -- hope that peace and freedom will not only survive but triumph, and perhaps sooner than any of us dare to imagine.

How could this be? Because this same 20th century that gave birth to nuclear weapons and totalitarian regimes, that witnessed so much bloodshed and suffering, is now moving inexorably toward mankind's age-old dream for self-determination and human dignity.

We see the dream alive in Latin America where more than 90 percent of the people are now living under governments that are democratic -- a dramatic reversal from a decade ago.

We see the dream stirring in Asia, where economies in Singapore, South Korea, Taiwan and China are vaulting ahead with stunning success.

We see the flame rising in places like Afghanistan and Angola where brave people risk their lives for the liberties we have enjoyed since birth. We even see the dream flickering in the captive nations of Eastern Europe. In Poland, men and women of great faith and spirit -- the members of Solidarity, the faithful of the Catholic Church -- rise up to struggle again and again for better lives and a future of hope for their children.

A powerful tide is surging, moving the world toward more open and democratic societies. And what is the driving force behind it?

It is faith -- faith in a loving God who, despite all the trials of the 20th century, has raised up the smallest believers

The World Almanac and Book of Facts 1988, p. 710 - First atomic bomb produced in Los Alamos, NM, exploded July 16, 1945 1619, p. 739 - bloodshed & suffering

Exceptions are Phillip Hughes NSC Chile Paraguay Uruguay Cuba Nicaragua Haiti re exceptions calculations based on Statistical Abstract of the United States 1985, U.S. Dept. of Commerce, vol. 1475, p. 859 - total 1984 pop. population 597,678k (90 = 357,910k) p. of 23 duno. countries 357,953k

Sparta is cited as ancient example of totalitarianism ENCYCLOPEDIA Britannica 1984 Ed. vol. 26, p. 871

1975 exceptions included (Brazil, Argentina)

Phillip Hughes The Urgency of International Tax Relief!! Cuban Revolution Supply Side Analysis April 22, 1985 JP

FACTS ON FILE, vol 41; no. 2706; MAR. 27, 1981 & Facts on File Yearbook 1984, p. 414

to stand taller than the most powerful state. And it is freedom -- freedom for people to dream, to take great risks to reap the rewards of their initiative and unique abilities to excel.

We've seen what restoration of those values, and our renewed belief in the moral worth of our open society have meant to America: A Nation rediscovering its destiny, poised for greatness.

The health and vigor of the American economy -- with 9 million new jobs -- has helped lift up the world economy, holding out to the family of nations the vision of growth.

The re-building of America's military might has rekindled the world's respect for American power, confidence and resolve.

And, now, a new idea filled with promise that may prove vital to peace. As most of you know, the United States and the Soviet Union have for decades used massive nuclear arsenals to hold each other hostage in a kind of mutual terror -- each side threatening massive retaliation against the other.

It's called mutual assured destruction; M-A-D or MAD as the arms control experts call it. As most of you know, the United States is now determined to lead mankind out of this prison of terror, to research and test a new system -- a non-nuclear defense that could provide a survival shield against incoming missiles; that would destroy weapons not people; that would protect our entire planet from nuclear weapons launched by design or by mistake.

America today has a foreign policy that not only speaks out for peace and freedom, but vigorously works for them as well. In

11/82 to 10/85 - 8,769 m - see U.S. Dept. of Labor Unemp. release Nov. 1, 1985 # of cur. emp. 11/82 99,098 k 10/85 707,867 k

ARMS & Politics; Robin Ranger; Sage Publishing; Ltd, Toronto; 1979, p. 12

SVEN Kraemer NSC 15010

NSC

OECD ECONOMIC Outlook 35 - July 1984 with U.S. strong economic performance is contributing to recovery in the rest of the world. p. 18

Steve Steiner

these past five years, not one square inch of real estate has been lost to communist aggression; and, Grenada has been liberated (and set free).?

So we look to the future with optimism, and we go to Geneva with confidence. We know that the differences between the United States and the Soviet Union are deep and abiding. But we share a common interest in dealing with those differences peacefully.

Ensuring a safer future requires that we address every threat to peace and every disruption of peace.

Since the dawn of the nuclear age, every American President has sought to limit the build-up in nuclear arms. We have gone the extra mile, but our offers have not always been welcome.

In 1977, the United States proposed reciprocal deep cuts in strategic forces, but these were immediately rejected by Moscow.

In 1981, we proposed the elimination of an entire class of medium range nuclear weapons. In 1982, my Administration proposed deep reductions in strategic forces. Again, the Soviet leadership rejected that proposal.

Then, in 1983, the Soviet Union unilaterally walked out of the negotiations.

I am pleased with the interest expressed by the new Soviet leadership in reducing offensive nuclear weapons. Let me repeat tonight what I announced last week: The United States is prepared to reduce offensive strategic weapons by over 50 percent, provided both sides make comparable and verifiable reductions resulting in equivalent strength with no first strike capability.

If we both reduce the weapons of war there would be no losers, only winners. And ultimately the whole world would benefit if we could mutually find a way to abandon offensive

Arms Control And Disarmament Agreements; Arms & Histories of Negotiations; U.S. Arms Control and Disarmament Agency; 1982 Edition; Intro- nation - p. 5 - 146 - US offered an at US to share (admit nuclear breach) NOV 15, 1982 INF START MAY 1982

ACDA
Sven Kramer
NSC
XSOIU

AN entire class of medium range nuclear weapons.

NSC
Sven Kramer

weapons in exchange for survival shields that would render nuclear weapons forever obsolete.

But nuclear arms control is only a partial answer: Since World War II, 20 million people have died in regional wars; not a single ~~one~~ ^{soldier has} perished ~~from~~ ^{in a} nuclear attack. The Soviet use of force directly and through its proxies has made the world a dangerous place for free men.

Look where the Soviets are pushing to consolidate and expand and what do we see? That there is no peace in Afghanistan; there is no peace in Cambodia; ^{Kampuchea?} no peace in Angola; no peace in Ethiopia, and no peace in Nicaragua. These wars have claimed hundreds of thousands of lives and threaten to spill across national frontiers.

That is why we have proposed a way to end these conflicts, a regional peace plan that calls for -- ceasefires, negotiations among the warring parties, withdrawal of foreign troops, democratic reconciliation and economic assistance.

The Soviet Union faces an historic crossroads in Geneva: to show the world by its deeds; to help us stop the killing; to make a lasting contribution to U.S.- Soviet relations.

This would be a true Geneva breakthrough. But we can do more, and I'm determined to try. I intend to offer the Soviets a comprehensive proposal to reduce secrecy, lessen distrust and bring forth a more "Open World."

I will propose to Mr. Gorbachev that we exchange thousands of our citizens from different fraternal, religious, educational and cultural groups.

Memorandum -
to the Cong.
to the Institution
of the Kukuk
4/15/1987-2058

Residential
documents;
October 24, 1985,
address to the
10th General
Assembly,
United Nations,
NY, NY

These people-to-people contacts can do much to bring our nations together. We are going to suggest the exchange of at least 5,000 undergraduates each year for two semesters of study, and a youth exchange involving at least 5,000 secondary school students who would live with a host family and attend schools or summer camps. We also look to increase scholarship programs, improve language studies, develop new sister city relationships, establish cultural centers and libraries and increase athletic and sporting competitions.

In science and technology we seek to inaugurate more joint space flights and establish joint medical research projects and institutes in each of our countries. In communications, we would like to see more appearances by representatives of both our countries in the other's mass media.

If Soviet spokesmen and commentators are free to appear on American television, and to be published and read routinely in the American press, are not American officials entitled to at least some access to the Soviet press?

While these proposals will not bridge our differences, people-to-people contact can build constituencies for peace in both our countries.

The conversations Mr. Gorbachev and I will have can help allay the suspicions that now exist. You can be sure I will reaffirm in Geneva what the Soviet leadership already knows: the United States is not an aggressor; we will never strike first against a foreign adversary. As Prime Minister Mulroney of Canada put it recently when told the United States was an

in response to a foreign leader critical of the

TMS

*Ersoegi
Irebakov on US TV*

US NEWS
And World
Report;
Nov. 4, 1985;
P. 12

~~United States~~ -- and I'm using the Prime Minister's words --
"What the hell [devil] do you mean 'imperialist' nation? We have a 5,000-mile border with them, and for 172 years there hasn't been a shot fired in anger."

A great danger in the past has been the failure by our adversaries to remember that while the American people love peace, we love freedom more -- and always stand ready to sacrifice for it. The only way major war can ever break out between our two countries is through this sort of miscalculation. By the way, our first meeting will be on the anniversary of the address at Gettysburg, where Mr. Lincoln reminded the world that "government ~~is~~ of the people, ~~for~~ by the people, ~~and~~ for the people shall not perish from the earth."

FAMILIAR QUOTATIONS;
John F. Kennedy
Bantlett;
Little, Brown
& Company;
Boston, 523

Both Nancy and I are proud and grateful for the chance you have given us to serve this Nation and the trust you have placed in us. And I know how deep the hope of peace is in her heart, as it is in the heart of every American mother.

Recently, we saw together a moving new film, the story of Eleni, a woman caught in the Greek civil war at the end of World War II, a mother who because she smuggled her children out to safety in America was tried, tortured and shot by a firing squad.

It is also the story of her son, Nicholas Gage, who grew up to become a reporter with the New York Times and who secretly vowed to return to Greece someday to take vengeance on the man who sent his mother to her death. But at the dramatic end of the story, Nick Gage finds he cannot extract the vengeance he has promised himself. To do so, Mr. Gage writes, might have relieved

the pain that had filled him for so many years but it would also have broken the one bridge still connecting him to his mother and the part of him most like her. As he tells it: "her final cry... was not a curse on her killers but an invocation of what she died for, a declaration of love: 'my children.'"

How that cry has echoed down through the centuries, a cry for the children of the world, for peace, for love of fellowman.

Here then is what Geneva is really about; the hope of heeding such words, spoken so often in many different places -- ~~in a desert journey to a promised land,~~ by a carpenter beside the Sea of Galilee -- words calling all men to be brothers and all nations to be one.

Here is the central truth of our time, of any time; a truth to which I have tried to bear witness in this office. When I first accepted the nomination of my party for the presidency I asked the American people to join with me in prayer for our Nation and for the world. I deeply believe there is far more power in the simple prayers of people like yourselves than in the hands of all the great statesmen or armies of the world.

And so, Thanksgiving approaches and I ask each of you to join me again in thanking God for all his blessings to this Nation and ask Him to guide us in Geneva. Let us work and pray that the cause of peace and freedom will be advanced and all of humanity served.

Thank you, God bless you and good night.

*hasen people
ing to promised
land*

?

KW

(Dolan)
November 5, 1985
12:30 p.m.

PRESIDENTIAL ADDRESS: TO THE NATION -- GENEVA SUMMIT

My fellow Americans. Good evening. In 48 hours, I will be leaving for Geneva to meet with Mr. Gorbachev, the leader of the Soviet Union. Before departing I felt it my duty to report directly to you on this meeting and its significance.

Now, I don't think it's any mystery why most of us regard summit conferences as a good idea. The danger of ^{All out} thermonuclear war and the havoc it would wreak are, as President Kennedy put it, a ~~modern~~ ^{NUCLEAR} sword of Damocles ^{hanging} dangling over all of us. The awful reality of these weapons is a kind of terrible crescendo to the steady, dehumanizing progress of modern warfare in this century. To a few people here in this office, I recently recalled a hotly debated issue in my own college years -- which by the way also took place in this century. Some of us strenuously argued that in the advent of another world war no civilized person, certainly no American, would ever obey an order to attack purely civilian targets. Humanity, we were certain, would never come to that. Well, World War II and 34 million ^{NSE} civilian casualties later we were all sadly, tragically wiser. At least today we can say we have fewer illusions: we know if World War III ever breaks out the destruction would be so devastating civilian casualties could reach 90 percent of the population.

To occupy this office is to live with that reality every day. Whenever I travel I am followed by a military aide who

Address in NY City
before General
Assembly of UN -
Public Papers
The Presidents
Sept. 25, 1961
p. 618 (620)

carries a small black attaché case -- "the football" is its nickname. It is a grim reminder of the narrow line our world walks every day it contains the codes necessary for retaliation to a nuclear attack on the United States.

And this office provides another sobering perspective on our world. The 23 million lives lost since the end of World War II in conventional wars are stark evidence that a nuclear conflict is far from the only danger we face. In recent years, America has had her share of fallen sons; Korea, Vietnam, other military engagements including terrorist attacks have been part of this terrible cost. And many times at this desk I have had to discharge the most difficult duty I have: to try and find words of comfort for grieving mothers and fathers. I don't have to tell you how regularly I fail at that; because there are no such words. Earlier this year when I visited those places in Europe that had seen so much suffering during World War II, a voice could be heard there, a voice from our century and from every century, the same voice I have heard in such sorrow here in this room, the voice of humanity crying out in anguish for peace -- for an end to war.

*Bergen-Belsen
Birkenau*

This is why I go to Geneva. For peace. And in hope -- the hope of never having to face that awful option of nuclear retaliation of never again having to speak from this office to grief-stricken loved ones. We go to Geneva seeking to work with the Soviet Union to reduce and eventually eliminate the danger of nuclear destruction, to resolve regional conflicts that can lead to wider war, to enhance respect for human rights, and to expand

the peace process by involving more directly the citizens of both our nations. And on this last point I will mention in a few moments the specifics of a new plan I have in mind.

But there is another reason we go to Geneva. Like the threat of nuclear war, it has to do with a danger unique to this century. Part of our heritage as Americans is our Founding Fathers' warning about history's most terrible but, somehow most easily forgotten lesson; that the abuse of government power poses the most serious and enduring threat to the freedom of man.

In our era, with the development of science and technology and the rise of modern ideology, we have seen a quantum leap in the nature of this danger and the birth of the gravest threat to freedom ever known -- the twentieth century police state, the totalitarian regime.

Now I don't think I have to elaborate on the human suffering caused by such regimes. The concentration camps or the forced famines, the massacres, the purges. The advent of totalitarian ideology -- an ideology that justifies any affront to the individual done in the name of the state -- has accompanied the worst assaults in history on the human spirit. On this point, my own views have been plainly stated. Only ~~as~~ a few weeks ago at the United Nations, I spoke of some specific instances: the invasion of Afghanistan that has cost between 750,000 and one million lives and nearly six million refugees, the intervention in the African nations of Angola and Ethiopia, the attempts to

WSJ

establish a totalitarian state in Nicaragua. This tragic, unhappy list goes on.

In forthrightly opposing such actions we Americans bear a grave responsibility and carry a special burden. A belief in the dignity and worth of every individual in the sight of God gave birth to this country. It is central to our being. "Our whole experiment is based on the capacity of the people for self-government," said James Madison. And Thomas Jefferson added; "Men were not born to wear saddles on their backs," and: "The God who gave us life, gave us liberty as well." This is our past, it is a part of us, we must never deny nor forsake it. Should the day ever come when the leaders of this Nation remain silent in the face of foreign aggression or stop speaking out about the repression of human rights then truly the cause of America -- the cause of freedom -- has been lost, and the great heart of this country has been broken. We Americans can never rest as a people nor say our work as a Nation is done until each man, woman and child on earth knows the blessings of liberty.

Reagan speech

Kennedy quote

See the words of yet another of our Presidents . . .

And this is the second reason I go to Geneva. For freedom. To speak for the right of every people and every nation to choose their own future for the right of human beings everywhere to determine their own destiny, to live in the dignity God intended for each of his children.

But let me stress here that not only is this candor and realism on behalf of freedom is our responsibility as Americans, it is essential for success in Geneva. Because if history has shown there is any key to dealing successfully with the Soviets

it is this: the Soviets must realize that their counterparts take them seriously and that we harbor no illusions about their ultimate goals and intentions. The Soviet mind is not the mirror image of the American or the Western mind. The Soviets have a very different view of the world. They believe a great struggle is already underway in the world and true peace can only be attained with the triumph of communist power. The Soviets sincerely believe the march of history is embodied in the Soviet state. So, to them, the mere existence of the democracies is seen as an obstacle to the ultimate triumph of history and that state. From the Soviet perspective, even if the democracies do nothing overt against their interests, just our survival, our continued resistance, is considered by them an act of aggression.

And that is why the Soviets tend to misinterpret well-intentioned public statements obscuring the nature of this struggle or minimizing the crucial moral distinction between totalitarianism and democracy. That is why sudden shifts in our realistic views about the Soviets tend to disrupt the negotiating process. In the past, when such shifts or statements have been made, the Soviets either regarded them as a ruse and reacted with distrust, or looked on them as hopelessly naive and attempted to exploit the illusions on which they rested. In both cases, the peace process and the business of serious negotiations have suffered.

So I must be blunt with you tonight I go to Geneva for peace and for freedom, but I also go without illusions. The fact of this summit conference does not mean the Soviets have forsaken

their long-term goals and objectives. President Eisenhower's somber warning in his farewell address unfortunately remain true: "we face a hostile ideology -- global in scope, atheistic in character, ruthless in purpose and insidious in method."

I do not mention all this, however, to sound unduly pessimistic or to paint a heedlessly discouraging picture. To the contrary, my mood about this meeting is one of cautious optimism. While it would be foolhardy to think one summit conference can establish a permanent peace, this conference can, I believe, help begin a permanent process toward peace.

But that is why realism is essential. For only by leaving our illusions behind and dealing realistically with the Soviets do we have any chance for true progress in Geneva.

Winston Churchill once said after a long experience of negotiating with the Soviets, "The Soviets will try every door in the home, enter all rooms which are not locked and when they come to a house that is barred, if they are unsuccessful in breaking through it, they will withdraw and invite you to dine genially that same evening."

Our goals next week in Geneva then must be peace and freedom -- and an end to illusions. But if nuclear war is an impossible option and so too is a world under totalitarian rule, how are we to steer between them? And what course are we to chart and what cause is their for hope?

My fellow Americans, I believe there is great cause for hope -- hope that peace and freedom will not only survive but triumph, and perhaps sooner than any of us have dared to imagine.

I also think it possible that history will record a great paradox about our century: that while it gave birth to the awful menaces of nuclear weapons and totalitarian regimes and saw so much bloodshed and suffering it was also the century that in its closing decades fostered the greatest movement in human memory towards free institutions and democratic self-rule, the greatest flowering of mankind's age old aspiration for freedom and human dignity.

Consider, for a moment, that at the start of the twentieth century there were only a handful of democracies in the entire world while today there are more than 50, with one-third of the world's population living in freedom. Here in our own hemisphere more than 90 percent of the people in Latin America are now living under governments that are either democratic or headed in that direction, a dramatic reversal from only a few years ago.

Even the communist world is far from immune to this worldwide movement. In an astonishing turnaround China has adopted sweeping economic reforms. Eastern European nations are seeking higher standards of living through free-market techniques. Although Polish Solidarity has been momentarily suppressed we know the hunger of the Polish people for freedom can never be completely stilled.

So, even in the communist world, we see the great longing for personal freedom and democratic self-rule, the rising realization that economic progress is directly tied to the operation of a free market, surfacing again and again. In one sense Karl Marx was right when he predicted: the demand for

economic well-being would bring the masses into conflict with the old political order. Only he was wrong about where this conflict would occur. It is the democracies that are vibrant and growing -- bringing to their people higher standards of living even as freedom grows while the communist world has economies that stagnate, technology that lags and people who are restless and unhappy with their lives.

In the Soviet Union too, economic difficulties have led to reappraisal and reexamination. Mr. Gorbachev himself has spoken to this issue and I intend to engage him further on this matter when we meet. Without being overly optimistic we should recognize that it has happened before in history: a small ruling elite -- when it meets firm resistance to foreign adventurism -- begins to ponder how to lend more legitimacy to itself by allowing people a greater voice in their own destiny.

Now, don't get me wrong; I hardly think we've reached this situation, not by a long shot. But, there is an historic trend toward more openness and democracy in the world and even in communist countries the momentum is building. What's the driving force behind it?

To begin with, the health and vigor of the American economy -- with 9 million new jobs -- has led to a reinvigoration of the world economy, and a new appreciation for the pragmatics of freedom.

Second, the restoration of America's military might has brought a new appreciation by the rest of the world for American power, confidence and resolve.

Third, this item I am about to discuss is actually related to our defense buildup but because I believe it is so vital to the peace process I wanted to treat it separately. As most of you know, the United States and the Soviet Union have for many years used massive nuclear arsenals to hold each other hostage in a kind of mutual nuclear terror -- one side threatening massive retaliation against the other. This has been known as mutual assured destruction; M-A-D or MAD as the arms control experts call it. I think you will agree there has never been a more apt acronym. As most of you know, the United States is now embarked on research and development of a new strategic defense system -- an intricate but workable series of non-nuclear defenses that could provide a survival shield in outer space against incoming nuclear missiles.

Now we have embarked on this program for a single reason: to end the madness of M.A.D., the insanity of mutual nuclear terror. Think what the advent of this new space shield -- a defensive system that would kill weapons not people -- could mean to our lives and the lives of our children. For the first time the great dread of the postwar period would be lifted because we would have some means as a people to protect ourselves from a nuclear attack launched either by design or by mistake.

Fourth, we must continue with a foreign policy that offers a wide range of peace initiatives even as it speaks out vigorously for freedom. Yes, we have been candid about the difference between the Soviets and ourselves and we have been willing to use our military power when our vital interests were threatened. And

I think we can be pleased with the results: for the first time in many years not a single square inch of real estate has been lost to communist aggression, in fact, Grenada has been rescued from such a fate and, in at least four other countries, freedom fighters are now opposing the rule of totalitarian leaders. But in addition to these firm foreign policy steps, we have also set in motion a wide series of diplomatic initiatives, perhaps the greatest number of such proposals in our history. They cover a range of areas: strategic nuclear weapons, intermediate nuclear weapons, chemical weapons, mutual troop reductions in Europe. The list goes on.

It is in this last area, the business of negotiation between the Soviet Union and the United States that this Geneva meeting takes on special importance. Too often in the past, the whole burden of Soviet and American relations has rested on one or two arms talks or even arms proposals. But while arms control is essential it can not be the only area of discussion, if this summit is to move the peace process substantially forward.

After careful consultation with our allies, Secretary Shultz flew to Moscow last week and established with the Soviets a four-fold agenda. So, we will be discussing in Geneva arms control, but also human rights; bilateral matters such as trade, scientific and cultural exchanges, but also regional conflicts such as those in Afghanistan, Angola, Cambodia, Ethiopia and Nicaragua.

I think this will be a breakthrough. And I am determined to continue in this direction in Geneva by offering the Soviets a

X

series of proposals that make up in their entirety a unique and even revolutionary approach. They are proposals for a more "Open World" that will invite the Soviet Union to participate more fully in the effort to reduce secrecy and distrust between nations.

First, in my United Nations speech of last year I mentioned a proposal for a series of "Umbrella talks" between the Soviets and ourselves. I will once again offer this proposal, suggesting not only regular summit meetings of the two heads of government but meetings at the cabinet and ministerial levels as well.

Second, in the area of arms control I intend to discuss our proposal for equitable and verifiable cuts of 50 percent in each side's strategic nuclear weapons and I intend to formally take up the issue of our strategic defense initiative. But rather than bargaining away this essential system or spending our time in Geneva bickering over who is building what and which side is destabilizing the other; I will discuss extending to the Soviets an invitation to share in the fruits of our research for deployment of this space shield.

Third, I will be proposing a wide series of people-to-people exchanges. Unlike the exchanges of the past, however, which were limited to a tiny number on both sides, I will be suggesting to Mr. Gorbachev that we exchange on a yearly basis thousands of our citizens from different community, fraternal and cultural groups; students, religious organizations and so forth.

These people-to-people exchanges can do much to bring the people of both our nations together. In this area we are going

to suggest for example the exchange of at least 5,000 undergraduates each year for two semesters of study, and youth exchange involving at least 5,000 secondary school age youngsters who would live with a host family and attend schools or summer camps. We also look to increase scholarship programs, to improve language studies, to develop and expand sister city relationships, to establish cultural centers and libraries and to increase bi-national athletic exchanges and sporting competitions.

In the areas of science, space and technology we would also seek to inaugurate more joint space flights and establish joint medical research projects and institutes in each of our countries. In the communications area we would like to see more extensive contact including more appearances by representatives of both our countries in the other's mass media. I've noted that Mr. Gorbachev has shown a lively appreciation for America's free press tradition; I can assure you I will be preaching the virtue of Soviet movement in this direction and will ask again, as I did several years ago in a speech to the British Parliament, for an opportunity to address the Soviet people.

Now I do not think these proposals by themselves will end our differences; but I do believe people-to-people contact can build constituencies for peace and freedom in both our nations.

To summarize then; I will be going to Geneva for peace and for freedom; without illusions; to put forward a whole series of "Open World" proposals that can lead to less distrust in the international climate.

The conversations Mr. Gorbachev and I will have together can help alleviate whatever suspicions and misunderstandings now exist between our two sides. You can be sure the Soviet Union knows the United States is not an aggressor and will never strike first against a foreign adversary. As Prime Minister Mulroney of Canada put it recently when he was told the United States was an imperialist Nation -- and I'm using the Prime Minister's words -- "What the hell do you mean 'imperialist nation?'. We have a 4,000 mile border with them and for 172 years there hasn't been a shot fired in anger."

A great danger in the past has been the failure by our adversaries to remember that while the American people love peace, we love freedom too and always stand ready to sacrifice for it. I want Mr. Gorbachev to know that the only way war can ever break out between our two countries is through this sort of miscalculation. By the way, my first meeting with Mr. Gorbachev will be on the anniversary of the Gettysburg address. You may be certain, he will be reminded that the American people are as determined as ever that "government by the people for the people and of the people shall not perish from the earth."

My fellow Americans, I hope you will permit me to say tonight that while this summit conference marks the culmination of much of our effort in the foreign policy area it is also, in another way, a milestone in a personal journey. That quotation from James Madison I mentioned earlier was from a speech that marked my entry into political life, more than two decades ago.

It was a time when many of us anticipated the troubles and difficulties of the years ahead and wondered if America would meet that challenge. She has, of course; and, as I said during the campaign last year, this is not the work of any one man or party. The accomplishment is yours; the credit belongs to you the American people.

Both Nancy and I are proud and grateful for the chance you have given us to serve this Nation and the trust you have placed in us. And I think you can understand why on the eve of our departure for Geneva my thoughts turn not only to you but to her as well: not just for all the support and love she has given me over the years but also because I know how deep the hope of peace is in her heart, as it is in the heart of every American mother.

Recently, Nancy and I saw together a moving new film, the story of Eleni, a woman caught in the Greek civil war at the end of World War II, a mother who because she smuggled her children out to safety in America was tried, tortured and shot by the Greek communists.

It is also the story of her son, Nicholas Gage, who grew up to become an investigative reporter with the New York Times and who secretly vowed to return to Greece someday to take vengeance on the man who had sent his mother to her death. But at the dramatic end of the story, Nick Gage finds he cannot extract the vengeance he has promised himself. To do so, Mr. Gage writes, would have relieved the pain that had filled him for so many years but it would also have broken the one bridge still connecting him to his mother and the part of him most like her.

As he tells it: "her final cry, before the bullets of the firing squad tore into her, was not a curse on her killers but an invocation of what she died for, a declaration of love: 'my children.'"

How that cry has echoed down through the centuries, a cry for the children of the world, for peace, for love of fellowman.

Here then is what Geneva is really about; the hope of heeding such words, spoken so often in so many different places -- in a desert journey to a promised land, by a carpenter beside the Sea of Galilee -- words calling all men to be brothers and all nations to be one.

Here is the central truth of our time, of any time; a truth to which I have tried to bear witness in this office. When I first accepted the nomination of my party for the presidency I asked the American people to join with me in prayer for our Nation and for the world. I want to remind you again that in the simple prayers of people like yourselves there is far more power than in the hands of all the great statesmen or armies of the world.

And so, as Thanksgiving approaches, I want to ask each of you to join me again in thanking God for all his blessings to this Nation and ask him to help and guide us as we meet next week in Geneva; let us work and pray that the cause of peace and freedom will be served and all of humanity ennobled.

God bless you and good night.

E300
.2
.543
1967
v.2
WHRC

THE
Jeffersonian Cyclopaedia

A COMPREHENSIVE COLLECTION OF THE
VIEWS OF

THOMAS JEFFERSON

Classified and Arranged in Alphabetical Order
Under Nine Thousand Titles

RELATING TO GOVERNMENT, POLITICS, LAW,
EDUCATION, POLITICAL ECONOMY, FINANCE,
SCIENCE, ART, LITERATURE, RELIGIOUS
FREEDOM, MORALS, ETC.

EDITED BY

JOHN P. FOLEY

WITH AN INTRODUCTION BY

JULIAN P. BOYD

VOLUME TWO

"I have sworn upon the altar of God eternal hostility against
every form of tyranny over the mind of man."—*Thomas Jefferson*

NEW YORK / RUSSELL & RUSSELL

ss and.—It is ball of liberty ss that, being imples to fol- ED., vii, 22.

to and.—Gen- n of liberty as t liberty which few or the rich 212. FORD ED.,

nd.—The God rty at the same destroy, but it rs of BRITISH 447. (1774.)

nd.—Light and H COXE. FORD

t believe our la- without a hope eady advance.— M., 1821.)

t.—The commo- a proof that the could not wish To EZRA STILES.

on and.—If the ved you from a all also be the eat a portion of and character of progressive prep- gressive portions and you may in supposing could intained, in the formation among M. CABANIS. iv,

ral.—Under the orn free.—LEGAL (1770.)

asy road to.— translated from feather bed.—To 132. FORD ED.,

ound of liberty is we must be con- n get, from time forward for what to persuade men t own good.—To FORD ED., v, 142.

and.—Possess- blessing of liberty ne to other coun- 18. (M., 1823.)

st." was the motto TOR.

— LIBERTY, Personal.—See PERSONAL LIBERTY.

4697. LIBERTY, Preservation of.—We do then most solemnly, before God and the world declare that, regardless of every consequence, 'at the risk of every distress, the arms we have been compelled to assume we will use with the perseverance, exerting to their utmost energies all those powers which our Creator hath given us, to preserve that liberty which He committed to us in sacred deposit and to protect from every hostile hand our lives and our properties.—DECLARATION ON TAKING UP ARMS. FORD ED., i, 474. (July 1775.)

4698. ——. I am convinced that, on the good sense of the people, we may rely with the most security for the preservation of a due degree of liberty.—To JAMES MADISON. FORD ED., iv, 480. (P., 1787.)

4699. ——. The people are the only sure reliance for the preservation of our liberty.—To JAMES MADISON. ii, 332. (1787.)

4700. ——. The preservation of the holy fire is confided to us by the world, and the sparks which will emanate from it will ever serve to rekindle it in other quarters of the globe, *Numinibus secundis*.—To REV. MR. KNOX. v, 503. (M., 1810.)

4701. LIBERTY, Preparation for.—A full measure of liberty is not now perhaps to be expected by your nation, nor am I confident they are prepared to preserve it. More than a generation will be requisite, under the administration of reasonable laws favoring the progress of knowledge in the general mass of the people, and their habituation to an independent security of person and property, before they will be capable of estimating the value of freedom, and the necessity of a sacred adherence to the principles on which it rests for preservation. Instead of that liberty which takes root and growth in the progress of reason, if recovered by mere force or accident, it becomes, with an unprepared people, a tyranny still, of the many, the few, or the one.—To MARQUIS LAFAYETTE. vi, 421. FORD ED., ix, 505. (M., Feb. 1815.)

4702. LIBERTY, The Press and.—Our liberty cannot be guarded but by the freedom of the press, nor that be limited without danger of losing it.—To JOHN JAY. FORD ED., iv, 186. (P., 1786.) See PRESS AND NEWS-PAPERS.

4703. LIBERTY, Progress of.—I cordially wish well to the progress of liberty in all nations, and would forever give it the weight of our countenance.—To T. LOMAX. iv, 301. FORD ED., vii, 374. (M., March 1799.)

4704. LIBERTY, Resistance and.—What country can preserve its liberties if its rulers are not warned from time to time that the people preserve the spirit of resistance?—To W. S. SMITH. ii, 318. FORD ED., iv, 467. (P., 1787.) See REBELLION.

4705. LIBERTY, Restricted.—I had hoped that Geneva was familiarized to such a

degree of liberty, that they might without difficulty or danger fill up the measure to its *maximum*; a term, which, though in the insulated man, bounded only by his natural powers, must, in society, be so far restricted as to protect himself against the evil passions of his associates, and consequently, them against him.—To M. D'IVERNOIS. iv, 114. FORD ED., vii, 4. (M., Feb. 1795.)

4706. LIBERTY, Royalty and.—The public liberty may be more certainly secured by abolishing an office [royalty] which all experience hath shown to be inveterately inimical thereto.—PROPOSED VA. CONSTITUTION. FORD ED., ii, 12. (June 1776.)

4707. ——. It is impossible for you to conceive what is passing in our conclave, and it is evident that one or two at least, under pretence of avoiding war on the one side, have no great antipathy to run foul of it on the other, and to make a part in the confederacy of princes against human liberty.—To JAMES MADISON. iii, 563. FORD ED., vi, 261. (Pa., May 1793.)

4708. ——. I am not for * * * joining in the confederacy of kings to war against the principles of liberty.—To ELBRIDGE GERRY. iv, 268. FORD ED., vii, 328. (Pa., 1799.)

4709. LIBERTY, Sacred.—For promoting the public happiness, those persons whom nature has endowed with genius and virtue should be rendered by liberal education worthy to receive, and able to guard the sacred deposit of the rights and liberties of their fellow citizens; and they should be called to that charge without regard to wealth, birth, or other accidental condition or circumstance.—DIFFUSION OF KNOWLEDGE BILL. FORD ED., ii, 221. (1779.)

4710. ——. The most sacred cause that ever man was engaged in.—OPINION ON THE "LITTLE SARAH". ix, 155. FORD ED., vi, 344. (1793.)

4711. LIBERTY, Safeguards of.—I disapproved from the first moment [in the new Constitution] the want of a bill of rights, to guard liberty against the legislative as well as the executive branches of the government.—To F. HOPKINSON. ii, 586. FORD ED., v, 76. (P., March 1789.)

4712. ——. To insure the safety of the public liberty, its depository should be subject to be changed with the greatest ease possible, and without suspending or disturbing for a moment the movements of the machine of government.—To M. DESTUTT TRACY. v, 569. FORD ED., ix, 308. (M., 1811.)

4713. LIBERTY, Science and virtue.—Liberty is the great parent of science and of virtue; and a nation will be great in both in proportion as it is free.—To DR. WILLARD. iii, 17. (P., 1789.)

* Jefferson was referring to the first French Republic.—EDITOR.

4714. — —. The general spread of the light of science has already laid open to every view the palpable truth, that the mass of mankind has not been born with saddles on their backs, nor a favored few booted and spurred, ready to ride them legitimately, by the grace of God.—To ROGER C. WEIGHTMAN. vii, 451. FORD ED., x, 391. (M., 1826.)

4715. LIBERTY, Sea of.—The boisterous sea of liberty is never without a wave.—To RICHARD RUSH. vii, 182. (M., 1820.)

4716. LIBERTY, Security for.—We agree particularly in the necessity of some * * * better security for civil liberty.—To JOHN TAYLOR. iv, 259. FORD ED., vii, 309. (M., 1798.)

4717. — —. Since, by the choice of my constituents, I have entered on a second term of administration, I embrace the opportunity to give this public assurance, * * * that I will zealously cooperate with you in every measure which may tend to secure the liberty, property, and personal safety of our fellow citizens, and to consolidate the republican forms and principles of our government.—FIFTH ANNUAL MESSAGE. viii, 53. FORD ED., viii, 396. (Dec. 1805.)

4718. LIBERTY, Subversion of.—The moderation and virtue of a single character have probably prevented this Revolution from being closed, as most others have been, by a subversion of that liberty it was intended to establish.—To GENERAL WASHINGTON. i, 335. FORD ED., iii, 467. (A., 1784.)

4719. LIBERTY, Universal.—The ball of liberty is now so well in motion that it will roll round the globe.—To TENCH COXE. FORD ED., vii, 22. (M., 1795.)

4720. — —. I sincerely pray that all the members of the human family may, in the time prescribed by the Father of us all, find themselves securely established in the enjoyment of * * * liberty.—REPLY TO ADDRESS. viii, 119. (1807.)

4721. — —. That we should wish to see the people of other countries free, is as natural, and at least as justifiable, as that one king should wish to see the kings of other countries maintained in their despotism.—To ALBERT GALLATIN. vii, 78. FORD ED., x, 90. (M., 1817.)

4722. LIBERTY vs. WEALTH.—What a cruel reflection that a rich country cannot long be a free one.—TRAVELS IN FRANCE. ix, 319. (1787.)

4723. LIBRARY, Circulating.—Nothing would do more extensive good at small expense than the establishment of a small circulating library in every county.—To JOHN WYCHE. v, 448. (M., 1809.)

LIBRARY/ 4724. LIBERTY, Founding.—There shall be paid out of the treasury [of Virginia] every year the sum of two thousand pounds, to be laid out in such books and maps as may be proper to be preserved in a public library;

which library shall be established at the town of Richmond.—PUBLIC LIBRARY BILL. FORD ED., ii, 236. (1799.)

4725. LIBRARY, Free.—No person shall remove any book or map out of the library; * * * but the same [may] be made useful by indulging the researches of the learned and curious, within the said library, without fee or reward.—PUBLIC LIBRARY BILL. FORD ED., ii, 236. (1799.)

4726. LIBRARY, Jefferson's.—You know my collection, its condition and extent. I have been fifty years making it, and have spared no pains, opportunity or expense, to make it what it is. While residing in Paris, I devoted every afternoon I was disengaged, for a summer or two, in examining all the principal book stores, turning over every book with my own hand, and putting by everything which related to America, and indeed whatever was rare and valuable in every science. Besides this, I had standing orders during the whole time I was in Europe, on its principal book-marts, particularly Amsterdam, Frankfort, Madrid and London, for such works relating to America as could not be found in Paris. So that in that department particularly, such a collection was made as probably can never again be effected, because it is hardly probable that the same opportunities, the same time, industry, perseverance and expense, with some knowledge of the bibliography of the subject, would again happen to be in concurrence. During the same period, and after my return to America, I was led to procure, also, whatever related to the duties of those in the high concerns of the nation. So that the collection, which I suppose is of between nine and ten thousand volumes, while it includes what is chiefly valuable in science and literature generally, extends more particularly to whatever belongs to the American Statesman. In the diplomatic and parliamentary branches, it is particularly full.—To S. H. SMITH. vi, 383. FORD ED., ix, 486. (M., Sep. 1814.)

4727. LIBRARY, Sale to Congress.—It is long since I have been sensible it ought not to continue private property, and had provided that at my death, Congress should have the refusal of it at their own price. But the loss they have now incurred, makes the present the proper moment for their accommodation, without regard to the small remnant of time and the barren use of my enjoying it. I ask of your friendship, therefore, to make for me the tender of it to the Library Committee of Congress, not knowing myself of whom the Committee consists. Nearly the whole are well bound, abundance of them elegantly, and of the choicest editions existing. They may be valued by persons named by themselves, and the payment made convenient to the public. * * * I do not know that it contains any branch of science which Congress would wish to exclude from their collection; there is, in fact, no subject to which a member of Congress may not have occasion to refer. But such a wish would not correspond with my views of preventing its dismemberment. My desire is either to place it in their hands entire, or to preserve it so here.—To S. H. SMITH. vi, 384. FORD ED., ix, 486. (M., Sep. 1814.) See 1133.

4728. — —. The arrangement [of the library at Monticello] is as follows: 1. Ancient * Jefferson's library was purchased by the United States Government for the use of Congress. The price paid was \$23,950.—EDITOR.

attainable a comprehensive and effective system of inspection and disarmament, because what I propose, I assure you, would be but a beginning.

Now from my statements I believe you will anticipate my suggestion. It is that we instruct our representatives in the Subcommittee on Disarmament in discharge of their mandate from the United Nations to give priority effort to the study of inspection and reporting. Such a study could well include a step by step testing of inspection and reporting methods.

The United States is ready to proceed in the study and testing of a reliable system of inspections and reporting, and when that system is proved, then to reduce armaments with all others to the extent that the system will provide assured results.

The successful working out of such a system would do much to develop the mutual confidence which will open wide the avenues of progress for all our peoples.

The quest for peace is the statesman's most exacting duty. Security of the nation entrusted to his care is his greatest responsibility. Practical progress to lasting peace is his fondest hope. Yet in pursuit of his hope he must not betray the trust placed in him as guardian of the people's security. A sound peace—with security, justice, wellbeing, and freedom for the people of the world—*can* be achieved, but only by patiently and thoughtfully following a hard and sure and tested road.

NOTE: The President's opening words "Mr. Chairman" referred to Nikolai Bulganin, Chairman, Council of Ministers, U.S.S.R., who served as chairman at this meeting.

167 ¶ Statement on East-West Contacts Delivered at the Geneva Conference.

July 22, 1955

ACCORDING to the adopted agenda, today we meet to discuss methods of normalizing and increasing the contacts between our

nations in many fields. I am heartened by the deep interest in this question, which interest implies a common purpose to understand each other better. Unfortunately there exist unnecessary restrictions on the flow between us of ideas, of things and of people.

Like other questions we have considered during the past four days, this one cannot be considered independently or in isolation. All are related by their direct importance to the general objective of lessening world fears and tensions.

To help achieve the goal of peace based on justice and right and mutual understanding, there are certain concrete steps that could be taken:

(1) To lower the barriers which now impede the interchange of information and ideas between our peoples.

(2) To lower the barriers which now impede the opportunities of people to travel anywhere in the world for peaceful, friendly purposes, so that all will have a chance to know each other face-to-face.

(3) To create conditions which will encourage nations to increase the exchange of peaceful goods throughout the world.

Success in these endeavors should improve the conditions of life for all our citizens and elsewhere in the world. By helping eliminate poverty and ignorance, we can take another step in progress toward peace.

Restrictions on communications of all kinds, including radio and travel, existing in extreme form in some places, have operated as causes of mutual distrust. In America, the fervent belief in freedom of thought, of expression, and of movement is a vital part of our heritage. Yet during these past ten years even we have felt compelled, in the protection of our own interests, to place some restrictions upon the movement of persons and communications across our national frontiers.

This conference has the opportunity, I believe, to initiate concrete steps to permit the breaking down of both mild and severe barriers to mutual understanding and trust.

up of an adequate collection method for the convenience of those who wish to make contributions on an installment basis.

It is my hope that all employees will give generously—not because they must, but because they may—keeping in mind the wide variety and large number of organizations they will be supporting through their gifts to this single appeal.

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER

NOTE: This memorandum was released at Geneva.

169 ¶ Letter to Prime Minister Maung Nu Concerning the Gift of the Burmese People.

July 22, 1955

Dear Mr. Prime Minister:

I know that you will be personally interested in the arrangements I have made for the use of the generous gift from the people and Government of the Union of Burma which you entrusted to me during your recent visit.

As you requested, the money will be used for the benefit of the children of those members of the United States armed forces who lost their lives or were incapacitated in the Burma campaign. To that end, I have directed that the fund be assigned in three equal portions to the American Legion, the Veterans of Foreign Wars, and AMVETS. Each of these three prominent veterans organizations has been carrying on worthy programs of assistance to the children of veterans of the armed services of the United States. Each of them, under the terms of its charter, will be able to establish a separate fund to achieve the purpose you indicated. The gift of the Union of Burma will thus strengthen and help to perpetuate the beneficial activities of those organizations.

I wish again to express my appreciation and that of the people of the United States for this heart-warming expression of the close

friend
count

NOTE:
Genev
Minist
which

My de

The
the U
gratit
made
the li
the Ja
ticula

170

the

Jul

Mr.

I

good

pred

cert

spea

my

B

fer

and

que

alre