

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: 12/08/1987 Message to America &
Soviet Peoples (Clark/Rowena) (2)

Box: 357

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/>

WITHDRAWAL SHEET

Ronald Reagan Library

Collection Name SPEECHWRITING, OFFICE OF: RESEARCH OFFICE
RECORDS

Withdrawer

MJD 6/2/2006

File Folder MESSAGE TO THE AMERICAN & SOVIET PEOPLES,
12/08/1987 (2)

FOIA

F03-0038/01

Box Number OA 18110

HOWELL

3

DOC NO	Doc Type	Document Description	No of Pages	Doc Date	Restrictions
1	DRAFT SCHEDULE	OF THE PRESIDENT	10	12/1/1987	B2 B7(E)

Freedom of Information Act - [5 U.S.C. 552(b)]

- B-1 National security classified information [(b)(1) of the FOIA]
- B-2 Release would disclose internal personnel rules and practices of an agency [(b)(2) of the FOIA]
- B-3 Release would violate a Federal statute [(b)(3) of the FOIA]
- B-4 Release would disclose trade secrets or confidential or financial information [(b)(4) of the FOIA]
- B-6 Release would constitute a clearly unwarranted invasion of personal privacy [(b)(6) of the FOIA]
- B-7 Release would disclose information compiled for law enforcement purposes [(b)(7) of the FOIA]
- B-8 Release would disclose information concerning the regulation of financial institutions [(b)(8) of the FOIA]
- B-9 Release would disclose geological or geophysical information concerning wells [(b)(9) of the FOIA]

C. Closed in accordance with restrictions contained in donor's deed of gift.

1ST STORY of Level 1 printed in KWIC format.

Copyright (c) 1984 Council on Foreign Relations, Inc.;
Foreign Affairs

1984/1985, Winter

SECTION: Pg. 219

LENGTH: 8455 words

HEADLINE: AFTER THE ELECTION: Foreign Policy Under Reagan II

BYLINE: Henry Grunwald; Henry Grunwald is Editor-in-Chief, Time Incorporated.

BODY:

... slow. No big breakthroughs should be expected. At all events, what is needed is a merger or at least a link of INF and START negotiations plus space-defense negotiations. The talks need not be fully integrated right away; they could begin separately and be linked gradually. The drawbacks of such a procedure are all too familiar: complexity and, through INF, the problem of how to bring the allies into the picture without either compromising their sovereignty and independence or else allowing them a role in the START area where they do not belong. n2 Despite such difficulties, it is impossible to see how anything can be accomplished without ultimately treating the issues of nuclear arms and arms control in their entirety. There is ...

... out separately in different arenas.

n2 See James A. Thomson, "After Two Tracks: Integrating START and INF," The Washington Quarterly, Spring 1984.

The foregoing would represent a fairly drastic change in the Administration's position on arms ...

6TH STORY of Level 1 printed in KWIC format.

Copyright (c) 1984 The Center for Strategic and
International Studies, Georgetown University;
The Washington Quarterly

1984 Spring

SECTION: APPROACHES TO ARMS CONTROL; Vol. 7, No. 2; Pg. 17

LENGTH: 6602 words

HEADLINE: After Two Tracks: Integrating START and INF

BYLINE: James A. Thomson - James A. Thomson directs Rand Corporation's research programs on national security strategy and on international security and defense policy.

BODY:

... negotiations are at odds with this doctrine and can undermine it. Further, the integrated approach would avoid one of the main obstacles of an INF agreement -- the large disparity between U.S. and Soviet INF that will exist even after completion of the U.S. INF deployment program.

On the negative side: The integrated approach would not avoid many other obstacles to START and INF agreements and is likely to delay, or even render impossible, an agreement to reduce central strategic arms. It would bring to the START table, where compromises may be on the horizon, all the difficulties of INF, where compromises seem unlikely.

The choice is between hoped-for early START results -- on the one hand -- and long-term strategic rationality and long-term hope for grappling with the INF problem, on the other. Faced with this choice, early START results would be desirable, on the grounds that the integration issue can be saved ...

8TH STORY of Level 1 printed in FULL format.

Copyright (c) 1983 The British Broadcasting Corporation;
Summary of World Broadcasts

December 14, 1983, Wednesday

SECTION: Part 3 The Far East; A. INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS; 1. GENERAL AND WESTERN AFFAIRS

PAGE: FE/7516/A1/1

LENGTH: 588 words

HEADLINE: Chinese View of Failure of US-Soviet Missile Talks

SOURCE: Xinhua in English 1651 gmt 9 Dec 83

Text of commentary by Xinhua correspondent Wang Chongjie, 'After the Geneva talks on Euro-missiles broke up'

BODY:

Following the breakdown of their talks on Euro-missiles not long ago, the United States and the Soviet Union have now suspended their fruitless negotiations on strategic arms limitation without setting a date for their resumption. When the world is wondering about whether the two sets of Geneva negotiations between the two rivals can be resumed, and how, if yes, Moscow and Washington are seen behaving quite differently [sentence as received].

Washington said the Soviets had no excuses to turn away from the INF talks. Predicting that they will soon return, Washington, backed by its allies in West Europe, declared that it is ready to join Moscow for new talks at any time and in any place. In retort, Moscow stressed repeatedly that it will not come back to the negotiation table unless the United States dismantles the missiles it has begun installing in West Europe.

It is quite unlikely that the United States and its Western allies would agree to Moscow's position.

The negotiations on strategic arms reduction were suspended indefinitely because of Moscow's reluctance to fix a date for further discussions. Moscow declared that 'in view of the deployment of the new US missiles in Europe that has already started, the changes in the global strategic situation make it necessary for the USSR to review all problems which are under discussion at START negotiations'.

Remaining available for further talks, Washington said that it is willing to negotiate with Moscow on the two questions either separately or in combination.

The two approaches reflect the different calculations of Moscow and Washington.

As the deployment of new intermediate missiles in Western Europe is already underway and no substantial concessions have been made on its part in the START talks, the United States wants to pass off as being enthusiastic for arms reduction and to hold Moscow responsible for the breakdown of the talks. In so doing, it aims to pacify the anti-nuclear movement in Western Europe, ease the

(c) 1983 The British Broadcasting Corporation, December 14, 1983

contradictions between the United States and European countries and facilitate President Ronald Reagan to beat his opponents in the presidential election next year.

The Soviet Union, while holding out in its tough stance on resumption of talks, has proceeded to deploy more SS-20 missiles directed at Western Europe. What is more, it has started deploying new tactical-operational missile systems in the GDR and Czechoslovakia, and even plans to place more submarine-based missiles that directly threaten the US continent.

It seems what Moscow has in mind is to exert stronger pressures on the West, give an impetus to the anti-nuclear movement in Western Europe, deepen the existing US-European contradictions and seek to influence the US presidential election in some way. Actually the Soviet Union has not shut the door tight. It is only seeking favourable conditions and opportunities for itself.

Observers here believe that the Soviet Union will not easily agree to resuming the talks within a short period of time but will make hard bargains instead. But judging from what the two superpowers have stated, one cannot rule out the possibility of having the START and INF talks continue in combination some day. It needs time to wait and see when and how the two superpowers will resume their talks. But one thing is quite certain: So long as the two sides are as insincere as before, it is impossible for them to reach a real agreement on limiting, reducing or destroying nuclear weapons.

12TH STORY of Level 1 printed in FULL format.

Copyright (c) 1983 Time Inc. All Rights Reserved;
Time

November 28, 1983, U.S. Edition

SECTION: WORLD; East-West; Pg. 30

LENGTH: 2343 words

HEADLINE: The Moment of Truth;
New U.S. missiles arrive, and the Soviets prepare to walk out of Geneva

BYLINE: By George Russell. Reported by Frank Melville/London, Strobe
Talbot/Washington, with other bureaus

BODY:

Western governments had long agonized over the decision. Soviet officials had churned out increasingly dire warnings of what the consequences would be if the decision was made. Step by ponderous step, the issue had grown in importance until it loomed as a fundamental test of wills between the Soviet Union and the 16 members of the NATO alliance. Last week the moment of truth was finally at hand in the protracted East-West war of nerves over the deployment of intermediate-range Pershing II and cruise missiles in Western Europe. The first new U.S. nuclear weapons had arrived. It was now up to the Soviets to make good on their many threats to begin a new and uncertain chapter in the tortuous history of the nuclear arms race.

For once, it seemed to be Moscow that was wavering. After a week of mixed diplomatic signals, Soviet arms negotiators indicated that they would attend at least one more meeting this week of the faltering Geneva arms talks that are intended to limit the spread of the intermediate-range missiles. The Kremlin's decision appeared to be a tactical one. The Soviets were waiting for the results of a vote in the West German Bundestag that is expected to give final approval to deployment of controversial Pershing II nuclear ballistic missiles on West German soil before the end of the year. A walkout by the Soviets at Geneva could occur at any time after the vote; the only uncertainty was over the walkout would occur, and exactly when. In the tense interlude, the new stage in the Euromissile campaign was dramatically summed up by the French President Francois Mitterrand in a national television appearance. Said he: "The crisis we are experiencing is the most serious the world has known since Berlin and Cuba."

It was a crisis that announced itself discreetly, with the touchdown of a U.S. Air Force C-141 Star Lifter transport at Britain's Greenham Common air force base, 50 miles west of London. Abroad the aircraft was a tarpaulin-swathed shipment of nuclear-tipped Tomahawk cruise missiles, the first of 41 nuclear weapons systems that are scheduled to be placed in Britain, Italy and West Germany by the end of the year. Word of the shipment's arrival was broken by British Defense Secretary Michael Heseltine, who made the announcement in the House of Commons to choruses of "Hear, hear!" from his Conservative Party colleagues and cries of "Shame!" from opposition Labor Party benches.

In the tumultuous parliamentary debate that followed, Prime Margaret Thatcher was treated to unusually hostile attacks. Newly chosen Labor Party Leader Neil Kinnock called her a "lackey" of the Reagan Administration for accepting the

(c) 1983 Time Inc., Time, November 28, 1983

weapons, Social Democratic Leader David Owen criticized the government for failing to insist on a so-called dual-key control arrangement with the U.S., which would have ensured a British veto over the use of the missiles. Such an arrangement, the opposition charged, was in effect in Britain during the 1950s and 1960s with an earlier generation of U.S. medium-range weapons. At that time, however, Britain had purchased the missiles from the U.S. to ensure dual control. In the case of the cruise missiles, the Thatcher government decided that the \$ 1.4 billion price tag was too high. In any case, the dual-key argument was not altogether relevant. In a series of written understandings dating back to the early 1950s, Washington and London have always acknowledged that the use of U.S. nuclear weapons based in Britain would require explicit permission from 10 Downing Street. Thatcher and President Reagan reaffirmed that understanding four months ago.

British antinuclear protesters quickly went on the offensive, demonstrating in London and attempting to obstruct the entrances to Parliament. At the heavily guarded Greenham Common base, where a makeshift women's "peace camp" has existed for 26 months, 150 demonstrators tried to block the gates. The authorities were unmoved: by week's end 550 protesters had been arrested. The day after his Commons announcement, Defense Secretary Heseltine came under assault personally. As he arrived to address a meeting of Conservative students at Manchester University, he was sprayed with red paint by left-wing demonstrators who screamed, "Better Red than dead!"

The hooliganism provided an ugly backdrop for the arrival of the cruise missiles, but far tougher threats have been hanging in the air for weeks. The person delivering them, in name at least, has been Soviet Leader Yuri Andropov, who has not been seen in public since Aug. 18. In an Oct. 26 Pravda interview, Andropov established the ground rules upon which the Soviets said they would act. Said he: "The appearance of new American missiles in Western Europe will make a continuation of the present [arms] talks in Geneva impossible." Andropov's failure to appear at the Nov. 7 military parade honoring the 66th anniversary of the Bolshevik Revolution fueled further speculation last week about the reasons for his absence, officially said to be the result of a "severe cold."

Andropov's statement was interpreted as an ultimatum buttressing the longstanding Soviet position at the Intermediate-range Nuclear Forces (INF) talks in Geneva: although Moscow insists on preserving a large number of triple-warhead SS-20 missiles aimed at Western Europe, not one new NATO missile was acceptable. The explicit threat was of a Soviet walkout at the talks and collapse, for a time at least, of the second track of NATO's "doubletrack" strategy, adopted in December 1979, of planning to deploy the new missiles while simultaneously talking about limitations on all such weapons in Europe. The chief Soviet arms negotiator in Geneva, Yuli Kvitsinsky, had even said privately that a walkout would come between Nov. 15 and Nov. 22. Were the Soviets bluffing? No one was sure.

The initial impression of U.S. officials in Geneva and Washington last week was that, after the arrival of the first cruise missiles in Britain, the Soviet walkout was imminent. As Heseltine made his announcement in London, the U.S. delegation, led by Chief Negotiator Paul Nitze, was holding a meeting in its eight-story headquarters, situated, ironically, on Geneva's Avenue de la Paix (Avenue of Peace). The delegates' purpose: to give a final review of a refined U.S. bargaining position that they intended to present to the Soviets the

(c) 1983 Time Inc., Time, November 28, 1983

following day. The U.S. proposal was an elaboration of a position previously outlined by President Reagan. It offered to reduce the number of new NATO single-warhead missiles in Western Europe to considerably fewer than the 572 Pershing II and cruise missiles currently planned. In exchange, the Soviets would have to reduce the number of SS-20s throughout the U.S.S.R. from 360 to 140.

Some American officials privately concede that the U.S. offer was largely cosmetic, designed to show the world that the Administration would stay at the bargaining table as long as was necessary to reach an agreement. The Soviets were equally conscious of the intent. The official news agency TASS had already put out a statement declaring that the forthcoming U.S. proposal was "patently unacceptable."

Then a strange diplomatic drama began. Half an hour after Heseltine spoke in London, a shipment of Soviet gifts, including caviar and vodka, arrived at the U.S. headquarters in Geneva. The gesture is customary at the end of each bargaining "round" of several months. The U.S., however, had proposed to keep the negotiations going until the year-end holidays. The Soviets had previously agreed to show up for the Tuesday meeting, but the arrival of the gifts was seen as a strong hint that the session would be the last one.

On Tuesday came a surprise. During a 35-minute session, by far the shortest of the two years of talking, Chief Soviet Delegate Kvitsinsky agreed to hold another session at the neobaroque Soviet mission two days later. Then he offered what amounted to a revision of Andropov's Oct. 26 ultimatum. According to Kvitsinsky, the threatened "consequences" of NATO missile deployment would occur with the arrival "on the continent of Europe" of "short-flight-time" systems on the periphery of the Soviet Union. His statement implied that collapse of the talks would occur only after West Germany had acquired its first complement of Pershing II missiles, which require twelve to 13 minutes to reach the Soviet Union (vs. several hours for a ground-launched cruise missile). The Soviets have always objected to the Pershing IIs more than the cruise missiles, not only because the ballistic Pershing IIs are faster but because the Soviets have a particular phobia of any German fingers near a nuclear trigger, even though the Pershing IIs will remain under the total U.S. control.

Why, then, the goodbye gifts? U.S. officials in Washington speculated that the Soviet delegation, acting on its own initiative, had assumed that the talks were about to collapse. According to the U.S. theory, the Soviets received overnight instructions from Moscow that said, in effect, "Keep talking -- at least for now."

Thursday's 2-hr. 15-min. missile meeting produced no movement between the two sides. The Soviets then insisted that the next meeting take place on Wednesday, Nov. 23. The demand was aimed at providing time for Moscow to digest the outcome of the Bundestag debate on the Pershing II deployment, which is not scheduled to come to a vote until late Tuesday, Nov. 22.

Despite the threats, the alliance has remained united in its resolve. After three days of debate, Italy's parliament last week voted, 351 to 219, to back the government of Socialist Prime Minister Bettino Craxi in fulfilling the Italian commitment to accept 112 cruise missiles as its share of the NATO nuclear burden. French President Mitterrand, whose country is not in NATO's military command though it is a member of the political alliance, used much of

(c) 1983 Time Inc., Time, November 28, 1983

a 90-minute television broadcast last week to put the blame for the missile crisis squarely on the U.S.S.R. He declared that "the leaders of the Kremlin seek to have a regional advantage and hope that they will perhaps succeed one day in separating Europe from the United States." In an acid commentary on Western Europe's active antinuclear peace movement, Mitterrand observed that "there are surely people in the Soviet Union who are pacifists, but their country is developing its armaments. In the West, on the other hand, we are developing pacifism."

With their eye keenly on the upcoming West German vote, the Soviets were making a final attempt to strengthen antimissile sentiments in Western Europe. Late last week a West German government spokesman said there had been a new "signal" from the Soviets, to the effect that they would drop their longstanding insistence on counting independent British and French nuclear forces in any Geneva agreement. There was less to the signal than the West Germans thought. In private discussions with Nitze in Geneva, Kvitsinsky had tried to get the U.S. to make a missile offer of "equal reductions on both sides," and said that if such an offer was made Moscow might be willing to postpone -- but not drop -- the issue of British and French forces. What Kvitsinsky meant by equal reductions on the American side was cancellation of the entire NATO deployment. The U.S.S.R., however, would be able to keep at least 120 SS-20s trained on Western Europe. The U.S. was not about to accept this feeler. Said a U.S. official: "It's still zero for us but not zero for them." Moscow leaked its version of the discussion in Bonn to muddy the upcoming Bundestag debate.

On the eve of the parliamentary vote, former Chancellor Helmut Schmidt appealed to a special conference of the opposition Social Democratic Party to support the deployments. West Germany, Schmidt told some 400 delegates, "must keep to its word in spite of all the disappointments about speeches and about behavior in Washington." He added: "My second reason is that the political equilibrium would be enduringly disturbed if the Soviet Union forged ahead with its unprovoked, one-sided buildup." The speech received only perfunctory applause. Said a delegate: "We see his voice as a voice of the party's past." At the urging of former Chancellor Willy Brandt and SPD Floor Leader Hans-Jochen Vogel, the conference voted overwhelmingly to reject the new missiles. Only 14 delegates supported Schmidt.

If the deployments go ahead, Moscow will probably fall back on other threats in addition to a walkout. One is to move new, shorter-range nuclear missiles onto the territories of East Germany and Czechoslovakia. The Kremlin has also said it would put the U.S. under an ill-defined "analogous risk." This might include the use of low-trajectory ballistic missiles, weapons useful for surprise attack, on submarines close to U.S. shores and the deployment of new cruise missiles on Soviet subs (see box). Nonetheless, the Administration remained confident that the Soviets would eventually return to the bargaining table. Said one official: "The Soviets don't have an alternative strategy to detente."

A muted recognition of that reality came from the Soviets last week as they marked the 50th anniversary of the establishment of diplomatic relations between their country and the U.S. "We have got to find a way out of this mess we are in," Soviet Ambassador to the U.S. Anatoly Dobrynin said at a commemorative dinner in Washington. Amid hints that Andropov might reappear for a meeting of the Central Committee next month, a message from him was conveyed to an Iowa banker. In it, Andropov said that the Soviet Union "has always been striving

(c) 1983 Time Inc., Time, November 28, 1983

to live in peace with all the states, to develop mutually beneficial cooperation also with the United States." Characteristically, Andropov noted that current tensions, including those brought on by the missile issue, were "by no means the result of the Soviet Union's policy."

GRAPHIC: Picture 1, Discreet arrival: a tight security cordon surrounds a C-141 StarLifter transport at Britain's Greenham Common airbase, STODDART -- GAMMA/LIAISON; Picture 2, A peace demonstrator appeals to Soviet Negotiator Yuli Kvitsinsky, Goodbye gifts, then a revised version of an ultimatum. MORVAN -- GAMMA/LIAISON; Picture 3, Controversial weapon: a Tomahawk cruise missile of the type being deployed in Europe, on a test flight in the Mojave Desert, BLACK STAR; Picture 4, U.S. Chief Negotiator Paul Nitze after a session last week, A cosmetic offer, and an agreement to talk again. MORVAN -- GAMMA/LIAISON; Picture 5, British bobbies drag away a peace protestor at Greenham Common, SAHM DOHERTY

14TH STORY of Level 1 printed in FULL format.

The Associated Press

The materials in the AP file were compiled by The Associated Press. These materials may not be republished without the express written consent of The Associated Press.

November 24, 1983, Thursday, PM cycle

SECTION: International News

LENGTH: 374 words

DATELINE: GENEVA, Switzerland

KEYWORD: Nitze-Text

BODY:

Following is the text of U.S. Ambassador Paul H. Nitze's statement following the Soviet suspension of talks with the United States on reduction of intermediate-range nuclear forces (INF) Wednesday:

The United States profoundly regrets the unilateral decision of the Soviet Union to discontinue the present round of the INF negotiations without setting a date for resumption. This decision is as unjustified as it is unfortunate.

The Soviet Union has rationalized the suspension of these negotiations on the grounds that approval by NATO parliaments of United States missile deployments and United States deployments of those missiles make continuation of such talks impossible. In 1979, when the United States first proposed INF negotiations to the Soviet Union, the Soviet Union had already deployed some 140 SS-20s globally. The global total of SS-20s now is 360, and this Soviet buildup continues. This continuing Soviet buildup has not prevented the United States from pursuing these negotiations and making every effort to reach an equitable agreement. These negotiations should continue until an agreement is reached.

The schedule for United States deployments has never been a secret, nor has the reason for them. They were mandated by the NATO 1979 decision as a necessary response to the Soviet deployment of SS-20 missiles. That decision also mandated an effort to limit such arms through negotiations between the United States and the Soviet Union.

The United States remains committed to reaching a negotiated solution which meets the legitimate security needs of all concerned. The United States delegation has sought, both formally and informally, to explore all opportunities for reconciling the differences between the two sides. The United States proposals are flexible and designed to meet expressed Soviet concerns.

The United States stands ready to halt or reverse its deployments if an equitable agreement to reduce and limit or eliminate United States and Soviet INF missiles can be achieved.

For its part, the United States remains prepared to continue the INF negotiations until an agreement has been reached and our two countries have thus fulfilled their responsibility to contribute to the cause of peace.

The Associated Press, November 24, 1983

16TH STORY of Level 1 printed in FULL format.

Copyright (c) 1983 The British Broadcasting Corporation;
Summary of World Broadcasts

November 23, 1983, Wednesday

SECTION: Part 1 The USSR

PAGE: SU/7498/i

LENGTH: 46 words

HEADLINE: Post-missile INF talks '' impossible' '

BODY:

Boris Ponomarev said in the December issue of 'World Marxist Review (Problems of Peace and Socialism)', according to Tass 'The introduction into Western Europe of new US missiles will make the continuation of the ongoing Geneva talks impossible.'* For details see Sections



AMERICAN COUNCIL OF TEACHERS OF RUSSIAN

OFFICE OF BILATERAL PROGRAMS

3014 Cleveland Avenue, NW
Washington, DC 20008
202-462-8820

MEMO

To: Rowena Itchon

From: Dan Davidson

Re: References to Russian Saints

Date: December 4, 1987

Here is a set of quotations selected from the writings of the Russian saints. I am sending along larger quotations which you may excerpt as needed.

Today there is a feast of regeneration for the people who are made new by the Resurrection of Christ, and all new things are brought to God: from heathens, faith; from good Christians, offerings; from the clergy, holy sacrifices; from the civil authorities, God-pleasing charity; from the noble, care for the Church; from the righteous, humility; from the sinners, true repentance; from the unhallowed, a turning to God; from the hating, spiritual love.

Cyril of Turov: Sermon on the First Sunday after Easter
[Cyril, Bishop of Turov, lived in the mid-12th century.]

Thou commandedst people to live without oppressing the other countries.

Alexander Nevsky (1220-1263) [In 1240, prayer to God upon hearing that the king of Sweden, a Roman Catholic, sent a message to Alexander saying that he was had arrived to conquer Alexander's people.]

"Tale of the Life and Courage of the Pious and Great Prince Alexander (Nevsky): Defeat of the Swedes in the Battle of Neva in 1240" from a 15th century text in the Second Pskovian Chronicle

The following three quotations are from Vladimir Monomakh, "Instruction to His Children" 1096 [Vladimir Monomakh, grandson of Yaroslav the Wise, came to power, and during his reign feudal wars ceased and the Russian princes united forces.]

Speak without guile, but try to understand. Be moderate in your language. Do not insult other people with your words.

Visit the sick and accompany the dead, for we are all but mortal. Pass no man without a greeting; give him a kindly word. Love your wives, but grant them no power over you. This is the end of all things: to hold the fear of God above all else. If you forget all my admonitions, read this counsel frequently. Then I shall be without disgrace, and you shall profit thereby.

It is good to be on one's guard; the divine guardianship is better, however, than man's.

English translations are cited from Medieval Russia's Epics, Chronicles, and Tales, ed. Serge A. Zenkovsky. Original Russian sources are available in Anthology of Old Russian Literature, ed. Ad. Stender-Petersen, New York: Columbia University Press.

If you need any further explication or quotations, let me know. You can contact me at the phone number and address at the top of this letter.

THE WHITE HOUSE
WASHINGTON

DRAFT

THE MEETINGS OF PRESIDENT RONALD REAGAN

AND GENERAL SECRETARY MIKHAIL GORBACHEV

MONDAY, DECEMBER 7, 1987 - THURSDAY, DECEMBER 10, 1988

12/01/87 9:00 p.m.

4:40 p.m. General Secretary and Mrs. Mikhail Gorbachev arrive Andrews Air Force Base.

CLOSED ARRIVAL
PRESS POOL COVERAGE
LIVE TELEVISION COVERAGE

Met by:

Secretary of State George Shultz
Mrs. George Shultz (O'Bie)

Brief arrival ceremony TBD.

4:50 p.m. General Secretary and Mrs. Gorbachev depart Andrews Air Force Base en route Embassy.

5:20 p.m. General Secretary and Mrs. Gorbachev arrive Embassy.

NOTE: General Secretary and Mrs. Gorbachev host a tea for Secretary of State and Mrs. George Shultz at Embassy.

Evening NO FURTHER EVENTS PLANNED

WITHDRAWAL SHEET

Ronald Reagan Library

Collection Name

SPEECHWRITING, OFFICE OF: RESEARCH OFFICE RECORDS

Withdrawer

MJD 6/2/2006

File Folder

MESSAGE TO THE AMERICAN & SOVIET PEOPLES,
12/08/1987 (2)

FOIA

F03-0038/01
HOWELL

Box Number

OA 18110

3

DOC Document Type

NO Document Description

*No of
pages*

Doc Date

*Restric-
tions*

1	DRAFT SCHEDULE OF THE PRESIDENT	10	12/1/1987	B2 B7(E)
---	------------------------------------	----	-----------	-------------

Freedom of Information Act - [5 U.S.C. 552(b)]

B-1 National security classified information [(b)(1) of the FOIA]

B-2 Release would disclose internal personnel rules and practices of an agency [(b)(2) of the FOIA]

B-3 Release would violate a Federal statute [(b)(3) of the FOIA]

B-4 Release would disclose trade secrets or confidential or financial information [(b)(4) of the FOIA]

B-6 Release would constitute a clearly unwarranted invasion of personal privacy [(b)(6) of the FOIA]

B-7 Release would disclose information compiled for law enforcement purposes [(b)(7) of the FOIA]

B-8 Release would disclose information concerning the regulation of financial institutions [(b)(8) of the FOIA]

B-9 Release would disclose geological or geophysical information concerning wells [(b)(9) of the FOIA]

C. Closed in accordance with restrictions contained in donor's deed of gift.

WASHINGTON WORK/PRIVATE TIME

NOTE: General Secretary Gorbachev hosts meeting with Senate and House Leadership at the Embassy.

10:20 a.m. General Secretary Gorbachev departs Embassy en route The White House.

10:25 a.m. General Secretary Gorbachev arrives The White House C-9 entrance.

THE PRESIDENT greets General Secretary Gorbachev at C-9 entrance and proceeds inside to the Oval Office.

STILL PHOTOGRAPHERS ONLY

THE PRESIDENT and General Secretary Gorbachev arrive the Oval Office and begin 3rd one-on-one meeting.

NOTE: Simultaneous Interpretation.

PRESS POOL COVERAGE (Beginning only)

GUEST AND STAFF INSTRUCTIONS

The following staff proceed to Cabinet Room:

TBD

The following staff proceed to Roosevelt Room:

TBD

The following staff proceed to West Lobby:

TBD

12:30 p.m. One-on-one meeting concludes.

THE PRESIDENT escorts General Secretary Gorbachev to C-9 to motorcade for boarding.

CLOSED PRESS COVERAGE

GUEST AND STAFF INSTRUCTIONS

The following staff to accompany THE PRESIDENT and General Secretary Gorbachev to C-9:

TBD

THE PRESIDENT bids farewell to General Secretary Gorbachev.

CLOSED DEPARTURE
STILL PHOTOGRAPHERS ONLY

12:35 p.m. General Secretary Gorbachev departs The White House en route Embassy.

PRIVATE TIME/LUNCH (6 hrs. 20 mins.)

1:00 p.m. General Secretary and Mrs. Gorbachev attend lunch at Department of State, hosted by Secretary of State and Mrs. George Shultz.

2:45 p.m. Lunch concludes.

2:50 p.m. General Secretary and Mrs. Gorbachev arrive Embassy.

3:30 p.m. NOTE: Mrs. Reagan hosts Mrs. Gorbachev for private tea and tour in Residence.

4:15 p.m. Mrs. Gorbachev departs The White House en route the Embassy.

GUEST AND STAFF INSTRUCTIONS

6:45 p.m. Proceed to South Grounds to motorcade for boarding.

MOTORCADE ASSIGNMENTS

Lead

Spare

M. Fitzwater
J. Kuhn

Limo

THE PRESIDENT
Mrs. Reagan

12/01/87 9:00 p.m.

Follow-up

Control

J. Hooley
Dr.
Mil. Aide

Support

G. Terry
Ofcl. Photographer
Medic

WHCA

Staff I

Senior Staff

Staff II

Staff

Press Van I

M. Weinberg

Press Van II

G. Foster

Ambulance

Tail

THE PRESIDENT and Mrs. Reagan proceed to motorcade for boarding.

6:55 p.m. THE PRESIDENT and Mrs. Reagan depart The White House en route the Soviet Embassy.

Drive Time: 5 mins.

7:00 p.m. THE PRESIDENT and Mrs. Reagan arrive Soviet Embassy for reciprocal dinner.

Dinner Scenario: TBD

PRESS COVERAGE TBD

GUEST AND STAFF INSTRUCTIONS

8:55 p.m. Proceed to motorcade for boarding.

MOTORCADE ASSIGNMENTS

Same as upon arrival.

9:00 p.m. THE PRESIDENT and Mrs. Reagan depart the Soviet Embassy en route The White House.

Drive Time: 5 mins.

9:05 p.m. THE PRESIDENT and Mrs. Reagan arrive The White House and proceed inside.

Morning

WASHINGTON WORK/PRIVATE TIME

9:00 a.m. General Secretary Gorbachev has brief meeting with Vice President Bush at Soviet Embassy.

9:15 a.m. General Secretary Gorbachev has breakfast meeting with Vice President Bush and selected Americans.

10:15 a.m. Breakfast meeting concludes. General Secretary Gorbachev departs Embassy en route The White House.

General Secretary Gorbachev arrives The White House C-9 entrance.

10:25 a.m. THE PRESIDENT greets General Secretary Gorbachev at C-9 entrance and proceeds inside to the Oval Office.

CLOSED ARRIVAL
STILL PHOTOGRAPHERS ONLY

10:30 a.m. THE PRESIDENT and General Secretary Gorbachev arrive the Oval Office and begin 4th one-on-one meeting.

NOTE: Simultaneous Interpretation

GUEST AND STAFF INSTRUCTIONS

The following staff proceed to Cabinet Room:

TBD

The following staff proceed to Roosevelt Room:

TBD

The following staff proceed to West Lobby:

TBD

12:00 Noon Meeting concludes.

THE PRESIDENT and General Secretary Gorbachev depart The Oval Office en route the State Floor via elevator.

GUEST AND STAFF INSTRUCTIONS

Only the following staff to accompany THE PRESIDENT and General Secretary Gorbachev to the State Floor via elevator:

Elevator Manifest

THE PRESIDENT
General Secretary Gorbachev
Interpreter
USSS
Elevator Operator
Others TBD

The following to proceed to State Floor via stairs:

TBD

12:05 p.m. THE PRESIDENT and General Secretary Gorbachev arrive State Floor and proceed to Family Dining Room for working lunch.

Working lunch begins.

PRESS POOL COVERAGE (Beginning only)

2:00 p.m. Working lunch concludes.

THE PRESIDENT and General Secretary Gorbachev depart the Family Dining Room en route the Blue Room.

THE PRESIDENT and General Secretary Gorbachev arrive the Blue Room.

Joined by:

Mrs. Reagan
Mrs. Gorbachev

THE PRESIDENT and Mrs. Reagan, accompanied by General Secretary and Mrs. Gorbachev, depart Blue Room en route Diplomatic Entrance via elevator for departure activities.

GUEST AND STAFF INSTRUCTIONS

The following staff to accompany THE PRESIDENT to Diplomatic Entrance via elevator:

TBD

The following staff to proceed to Diplomatic Entrance via stairs:

TRD

Upon arrival at Diplomatic Entrance, staff will be escorted to __ to view departure activities.

THE PRESIDENT and Mrs. Reagan, accompanied by General Secretary and Mrs. Gorbachev, arrive Diplomatic Room and proceed outside.

PRESS POOL COVERAGE
LIVE TELEVISION COVERAGE

THE PRESIDENT and Mrs. Reagan, accompanied by General Secretary and Mrs. Gorbachev, proceed to dais.

Departure activities TBD (3-5 min. remarks)

Departure activities conclude.

2:15 p.m. THE PRESIDENT and Mrs. Reagan escort General Secretary and Mrs. Gorbachev to motorcade and bid farewell.

CLOSED ARRIVAL
PRESS POOL COVERAGE
LIVE TELEVISION COVERAGE

General Secretary and Mrs. Gorbachev depart The White House en route Embassy.

OFFICIAL VISIT ENDS

3:00 p.m. (T) General Secretary Gorbachev hosts meeting with industry and business community at New Embassy.

5:30 p.m. General Secretary Gorbachev holds press conference at New Embassy.

PRESS COVERAGE TBD
LIVE TELEVISION COVERAGE

8:00 p.m. Departure from Andrews Air Force Base.

PRESS POOL COVERAGE
LIVE TELEVISION COVERAGE

THE WHITE HOUSE

Office of the Press Secretary
(New York, New York)

For Immediate Release

September 21, 1987

REMARKS BY THE PRESIDENT
TO THE 42ND GENERAL ASSEMBLY
OF THE UNITED NATIONS

United Nations Building
New York, New York

11:02 A.M. EDT

THE PRESIDENT: Mr. President, Mr. Secretary General, Ambassador Reed, honored guests and distinguished delegates: Let me first welcome the Secretary General back from his pilgrimage for peace in the Middle East. Hundreds of thousands have already fallen in the bloody conflict between Iran and Iraq. All men and women of goodwill pray that the carnage can soon be stopped, and we pray that the Secretary General proves to be not only a pilgrim but also the architect of a lasting peace between those two nations. Mr. Secretary General, the United States supports you, and may God guide you in your labors ahead.

Like the Secretary General, all of us here today are on a kind of pilgrimage. We come from every continent, every race, and most religions to this great hall of hope where, in the name of peace, we practice diplomacy. Now, diplomacy, of course, is a subtle and nuanced craft -- so much so that it's said that when one of the most wily diplomats of the 19th century passed away, other diplomats asked, on reports of his death, "What do you suppose the old fox meant by that?"

But true statesmanship requires not merely skill but something greater, something we call vision -- a grasp of the present and of the possibilities of the future. I've come here today to map out for you my own vision of the world's future -- one, I believe, that in its essential elements, is shared by all Americans. And I hope those who see things differently will not mind if I say that we in the United States believe that the place to look first for shape of the future is not in continental masses and sea lanes, although geography is, obviously, of great importance. Neither is it in national reserves of blood and iron or, on the other hand, of money and industrial capacity, although military and economic strength are also, of course, crucial. We begin with something that is far simpler and yet far more profound -- the human heart.

All over the world today, the yearnings of the human heart are redirecting the course of international affairs, putting the lie to the myth of materialism and historical determinism. We have only to open our eyes to see the simple aspirations of ordinary people writ large on the record of our times.

Last year in the Philippines, ordinary people rekindled the spirit of democracy and restored the electoral process. Some said they had performed a miracle, and if so, a similar miracle -- a transition to democracy -- is taking place in the Republic of Korea. Haiti, too, is making a transition. Some despair when these new, young democracies face conflicts or challenges, but growing pains are normal in democracies. The United States had them -- as has every other democracy on Earth.

In Latin America, too, one can hear the voices of freedom echo from the peaks and across the plains. It is the song of ordinary people marching, not in uniforms and not in military file,

MORE

but, rather, one by one in simple, everyday working clothes -- marching to the polls. Ten years ago, only a third of the people of Latin America and the Caribbean lived in democracies or in countries that were turning to democracy. Today over 90 percent do.

But this worldwide movement to democracy is not the only way in which simple, ordinary people are leading us in this room -- we who are said to be the makers of history -- leading us into the future. Around the world, new businesses, new economic growth, new technologies are emerging from the workshops of ordinary people with extraordinary dreams.

Here in the United States, entrepreneurial energy -- reinvigorated when we cut taxes and regulations -- has fueled the current economic expansion. According to scholars at the Massachusetts Institute of Technology, three-quarters of the more than 13.5 million new jobs that we have created in this country since the beginning of our expansion came from businesses with fewer than 100 employees -- businesses started by ordinary people who dared to take a chance. And many of our new high technologies were first developed in the garages of fledgling entrepreneurs. Yet America is not the only or perhaps even the best example of the dynamism and dreams that the freeing of markets set free.

In India and China, freer markets for farmers have led to an explosion in production. In Africa, governments are rethinking their policies, and where they're allowing greater economic freedom to farmers crop production has improved. Meanwhile, in the newly industrialized countries of the Pacific Rim, free markets in services and manufacturing as well as agriculture have led to a soaring of growth and standards of living. The ASEAN nations, Japan, Korea, and Taiwan have created the true economic miracle of the last two decades, and in each of them, much of the magic came from ordinary people who succeeded as entrepreneurs.

In Latin America, this same lesson of free markets, greater opportunity, and growth is being studied and acted on. President Sarney of Brazil spoke for many others when he said that, "Private initiative is the engine of economic development. In Brazil we have learned that every time the state's penetration in the economy increases, our liberty decreases." Yes, policies that release to flight ordinary people's dreams are spreading around the world. From Columbia to Turkey to Indonesia, governments are cutting taxes, reviewing their regulations, and opening opportunities for initiative.

There has been much talk in the halls of this building about the "right to development." But more and more the evidence is clear that development is not itself a right. It is the product of rights -- the right to own property; the right to buy and sell freely; the right to contract; the right to be free of excessive taxation and regulation, of burdensome government. There have been studies that determined that countries with low tax rates have greater growth than those with high rates.

We're all familiar with the phenomenon of the "underground economy." The scholar, Hernando de Soto, and his colleagues have examined the situation of one country, Peru, and described an economy of the poor that bypasses crushing taxation and stifling regulation. This "informal economy," as the researchers call it, is the principal supplier of many goods and services and often the only ladder for upward mobility. In the capital city, it accounts for almost all public transportation and most street markets. And the researchers concluded that, thanks to the informal economy, "The poor can work, travel, and have a roof over their heads." They might have added that, by becoming underground entrepreneurs themselves or by working for them, the poor have become less poor and the nation itself richer.

Those who advocate statist solutions to development

MORE

should take note -- the free market is the other path to development and the one true path. And, unlike many other paths, it leads somewhere. It works. So this is where I believe we can find the map to the world's future -- in the hearts of ordinary people; in their hopes for themselves and their children; in their prayers as they lay themselves and their families to rest each night. These simple people are the giants of the Earth, the true builders of the world and shapers of the centuries to come. And if indeed they triumph, as I believe they will, we will at last know a world of peace and freedom, opportunity and hope, and, yes, of democracy -- a world in which the spirit of mankind at last conquers the old, familiar enemies of famine, disease, tyranny, and war.

This is my vision -- America's vision. I recognize that some governments represented in this hall have other ideas. Some do not believe in democracy or in political, economic, or religious freedom. Some believe in dictatorship -- whether by one man, one party, one class, one race, or one vanguard. To those governments I would only say that the price of oppression is clear. Your economies will fall farther and farther behind. Your people will become more restless. Isn't it better to listen to the people's hopes now, rather than their curses later?

And yet, despite our differences, there is one common hope that brought us all to make this common pilgrimage - the hope that mankind will one day beat its swords into plowshares; the hope of peace.

In no place on Earth today is peace more in need of friends than the Middle East. Its people's yearning for peace is growing. The United States will continue to be an active partner in the efforts of the parties to come together to settle their differences and build a just and lasting peace.

And this month marks the beginning of the eighth year of the Iran-Iraq War. Two months ago, the Security Council adopted a mandatory resolution demanding a cease-fire, withdrawal, and negotiations to end the war. The United States fully supports implementation of Resolution 598, as we support the Secretary General's recent mission. We welcomed Iraq's acceptance of that resolution, and remain disappointed at Iran's unwillingness to accept it.

In that regard, I know that the President of Iran will be addressing you tomorrow. I take this opportunity to call upon him clearly and unequivocally to state whether Iran accepts 598 or not. If the answer is positive, it would be a welcome step and major breakthrough. If it is negative, the Council has no choice but rapidly to adopt enforcement measures.

For 40 years the United States has made it clear -- its vital interest in the security of the Persian Gulf and the countries that border it. The oil reserves there are of strategic importance to the economies of the free world. We're committed to maintaining the free flow of this oil and to preventing the domination of the region by any hostile power.

We do not seek confrontation or trouble with Iran or anyone else. Our object is -- or, objective is now, and has been at every stage, finding a means to end the war with no victor and no vanquished. The increase in our naval presence in the Gulf does not favor one side or the other. It is a response to heightened tensions and followed consultations with our friends in the region. When the tension diminishes, so will our presence.

The United States is gratified by many recent diplomatic developments -- the unanimous adoption of Resolution 598, the Arab League's statement at its recent meeting in Tunis, and the Secretary General's visit. Yet problems remain.

The Soviet Union helped in drafting and reaching an agreement on Resolution 598. But outside the Security Council, the Soviets have acted differently. They called for removal of our Navy from the Gulf, where it has been for 40 years. They made the false accusation that somehow the United States -- rather than the war itself -- is the source of tension in the Gulf. Well, such statements are not helpful. They divert attention from the challenge facing us all -- a just end to the war.

The United States hopes the Soviets will join the other members of the Security Council in vigorously seeking an end to a conflict that never should have begun -- should have ended long ago, and has become one of the great tragedies of the postwar era.

Elsewhere in the region, we see the continuing Soviet occupation of Afghanistan. After nearly eight years, a million casualties, nearly four million others driven into exile, and more intense fighting than ever -- it's time for the Soviet Union to leave.

The Afghan people must have the right to determine their own future free of foreign coercion. There is no excuse for prolonging a brutal war or propping up a regime whose days are clearly numbered. That regime offers political proposals that pretend compromise, but really would ensure the perpetuation of the regime's power. Those proposals have failed the only significant test -- they have been rejected by the Afghan people. Every day the resistance grows in strength. It is an indispensable party in the quest for a negotiated solution.

The world community must continue to insist on genuine self-determination, prompt and full Soviet withdrawal, and the return of the refugees to their homes in safety and honor. The attempt may be made to pressure a few countries to change their vote this year, but this body, I know, will vote overwhelmingly, as every year before, for Afghan independence and freedom.

We have noted General Secretary Gorbachev's statement of readiness to withdraw. In April I asked the Soviet Union to set a date this year when this withdrawal would begin. I repeat that request now, in this forum for peace. I pledge that, once the Soviet Union shows convincingly that it's ready for a genuine political settlement, the United States is ready to be helpful.

Let me add one final note on this matter. Pakistan, in the face of enormous pressure and intimidation, has given sanctuary to Afghan refugees. We salute the courage of Pakistan and the Pakistani people. They deserve strong support from all of us.

Another regional conflict, we all know, is taking place in Central America -- in Nicaragua.

To the Sandinista delegation here today I say: Your people know the true nature of your regime. They have seen their liberties suppressed. They have seen the promises of 1979 go unfulfilled. They have seen their real wages and personal income fall by half -- yes, half -- since 1979, while your party elite live lives of privilege and luxury.

This is why, despite a billion dollars in Soviet-bloc aid last year alone, despite the largest and best-equipped army in Central America, you face a popular revolution at home. It is why the democratic resistance is able to operate freely deep in your heartland. But this revolution should come as no surprise to you. It is only the revolution you promised the people, and that you then betrayed.

The goal of United States policy towards Nicaragua is simple. It is the goal of the Nicaraguan people and the freedom fighters as well: It is democracy -- real, free, pluralistic,

constitutional democracy. Understand this: We will not, and the world community will not, accept phoney "democratization" designed to mask the perpetuation of dictatorship.

In this 200th year of our own Constitution, we know that real democracy depends on the safeguards of an institutional structure that prevents a concentration of power. It is that which makes rights secure. The temporary relaxation of controls -- which can later be tightened -- is not democratization.

And, again, to the Sandinistas, I say: We continue to hope that Nicaragua will become part of the genuine transformation -- democratic transformation -- that we have seen throughout Central America in this decade. We applaud the principles embodied in the Guatemala agreement, which links the security of the Central American democracies to democratic reform in Nicaragua. Now is the time for you to shut down the military machine that threatens your neighbors and assaults your own people. You must end your stranglehold on internal political activity. You must hold free and fair national elections. The media must be truly free -- not censored or intimidated or crippled by indirect measures like the denial of newsprint or threats against journalists or their families. Exiles must be allowed to return to minister, to live, to work, and to organize politically. Then, when persecution of religion has ended, and the jails no longer contain political prisoners, national reconciliation and democracy will be possible.

Unless this happens, "democratization" will be a fraud. And until it happens, we will press for true democracy by supporting those fighting for it.

Freedom in Nicaragua or Angola or Afghanistan or Cambodia or Eastern Europe or South Africa or anyplace else on the globe is not just an internal matter. Some time ago the Czech dissident writer, Vaclav Havel warned the world that, "respect for human rights is the fundamental condition and the sole genuine guarantee of true peace." And Andrei Sakharov, in his Nobel Lecture, said: "I am convinced that international confidence, mutual understanding, disarmament, and international security are inconceivable without an open society with freedom of information, freedom of conscience, the right to publish, and the right to travel and choose the country in which one wishes to live."

Freedom serves peace. The quest for peace must serve the cause of freedom. Patient diplomacy can contribute to a world in which both can flourish. We're heartened by new prospects for improvement in East-West and particularly U.S.-Soviet relations.

Last week Soviet Foreign Minister Shevardnadze visited Washington for talks with me and with the Secretary of State -- Shultz. We discussed the full range of issues, including my longstanding efforts to achieve, for the first time, deep reductions in U.S. and Soviet nuclear arms. It was six years ago, for example, that I proposed the "zero option" for U.S. and Soviet longer-range, intermediate-range nuclear missiles. I'm pleased that we have now agreed in principle to a truly historic treaty that will eliminate an entire class of U.S. and Soviet nuclear weapons. We also agreed to intensify our diplomatic efforts in all areas of mutual interest.

Toward that end, Secretary Shultz and the Foreign Minister will meet again, a month from now, in Moscow, and I will meet again with General Secretary Gorbachev later this fall.

We continue to have our differences and probably always will. But that puts a special responsibility on us to find ways -- realistic ways -- to bring greater stability to our competition and to show the world a constructive example of the value of communication and of the possibility of peaceful solutions to political problems.

And here let me add that we seek, though our Strategic Defense Initiative, to find a way to keep peace through relying on defense -- not offense -- for deterrence and for eventually rendering ballistic missiles obsolete. SDI has greatly enhanced the prospects for real arms reduction. It is a crucial part of our efforts to ensure a safer world and a more stable strategic balance.

We will continue to pursue the goal of arms reduction, particularly the goal that the General Secretary and I agreed upon -- a 50-percent reduction in our respective strategic nuclear arms. We will continue to press the Soviets for more constructive conduct in the settling of regional conflicts. We look to the Soviets to honor the Helsinki Accords. We look for greater freedom for the Soviet peoples within their country, more people-to-people exchanges with our country, and Soviet recognition in practice of the right of freedom of movement.

We look forward to a time when things we now regard as sources of friction and even danger can become examples of cooperation between ourselves and the Soviet Union. For instance, I have proposed a collaboration to reduce the barriers between East and West in Berlin, and more broadly in Europe as a whole. Let us work together for a Europe in which force of the threat -- or force, whether in the form of walls or of guns, is no longer an obstacle to free choice by individuals and whole nations. I have also called for more openness in the flow of information from the Soviet Union about its military forces, policies, and programs so that our negotiations about arms reductions can proceed with greater confidence.

We hear much about changes in the Soviet Union. We're intensely interested in these changes. We hear the word, "glasnost," which is translated as "openness" in English. "Openness" is a broad term. It means the free, unfettered flow of information, ideas, and people. It means political and intellectual liberty in all its dimensions. We hope, for the sake of the peoples of the USSR, that such changes will come. And we hope, for the sake of peace, that it will include a foreign policy that respects the freedom and independence of other peoples.

No place should be better suited for discussions of peace than this hall. The first Secretary General, Trygve Lie, said of the United Nations: "With the danger of fire, and in the absence of an organized fire department, it is only common sense for the neighbors to join in setting up their own fire brigades."

Joining together to drown the flames of war -- this, together with a Universal Declaration of Human Rights, was the founding ideal of the United Nations. It is our continuing challenge to ensure that the U.N. lives up to these hopes.

As the Secretary General noted some time ago, the risk of anarchy in the world has increased because the fundamental rules of the U.N. Charter have been violated. The General Assembly has repeatedly acknowledged this with regard to the occupation of Afghanistan. The Charter has a concrete practical meaning today because it touches on all the dimensions of human aspiration that I mentioned earlier -- the yearning for democracy and freedom, for global peace, and for prosperity.

This is why we must protect the Universal Declaration of Human Rights from being debased as it was through the infamous "Zionism is Racism" resolution. We cannot permit attempts to control the media and promote censorship under the ruse of a so-called, "New World Information Order." We must work against efforts to introduce contentious and non-relevant issues into the work of the specialized and technical agencies where we seek progress on urgent problems from terrorism to drug trafficking to nuclear proliferation, which threaten us all. Such efforts corrupt the Charter and weaken this organization.

There have been important administrative and budget reforms. They have helped. The United States is committed to restoring its contribution as reforms progress. But there is still much to do. The United Nations was built on great dreams and great ideals. Sometimes it has strayed. It is time for it to come home.

It was Dag Hammarskjold who said, "the end of all political effort must be the well-being of the individual in a life of safety and freedom." Well, should this not be our credo in the years ahead?

I have spoken today of a vision and the obstacles to its realization. More than a century ago a young Frenchman, Alexis de Tocqueville, visited America. After that visit he predicted that the two great powers of the future world would be, on one hand, the United States, which would be built, as he said, "by the plowshare," and, on the other, Russia, which would go forward, again, as he said, "by the sword." Yet need it be so? Cannot swords be turned to plowshares? Can we and all nations not live in peace?

In our obsession with antagonisms of the moment, we often forget how much unites all the members of humanity. Perhaps we need some outside, universal threat to make us recognize this common bond. I occasionally think how quickly our differences worldwide would vanish if we were facing an alien threat from outside this world. And yet, I ask you, is not an alien force already among us? What could be more alien to the universal aspirations of our peoples than war and the threat of war?

Two centuries ago, in a hall much smaller than this one, in Philadelphia, Americans met to draft a Constitution. In the course of their debates, one of them said that the new government, if it was to rise high, must be built on the broadest base, the will and consent of the people. And so it was. And so it has been.

My message today is that the dreams of ordinary people reach to astonishing heights. If we diplomatic pilgrims are to achieve equal altitudes, we must build all we do on the full breadth of humanity's will and consent and the full expanse of the human heart.

Thank you and God bless you all. (Applause.)

END

11:33 A.M. EDT

AMERICA

"America is a place where people can be themselves."

Norman Cousins
 "They Love Us for the Wrong Reasons"
 1952

"All families have something of the Santa Claus tradition in their heritage. And so does the United States as a nation. It has been a good heritage, for us as a people, and for the world."

Duncan Emrich
Folklore on the American Land
 1972

"Countries have a habit of becoming metaphors, and America is no exception. Indeed, it has probably stood for more things to more people than any other nation on the face of the globe."

J. Martin Evans
America: The View from Europe
 1976

"Some people are bothered by the fact that the United States is no longer Number 1 in every aspect of power and influence, but I'm not. It was a kind of game with some of our leaders—saying that we should be the greatest, the richest and the fastest. It's just not all that important whether we're the biggest and the best in every respect. I don't think we have to be first in all things, since I think we excel in the most important way: Our living conditions are best, and we have tried to keep the peace."

Arthur Fiedler
U.S. News & World Report
 Mar. 7, 1977

"America is a willingness of the heart."

F. Scott Fitzgerald
 Quoted by Matthew J. Bruccoli
Some Sort of Epic Grandeur
 1981

"If ever a nation was free to break the cycle of empires, America is that nation."

J. William Fulbright
New York Times
 Jan. 27, 1968

"My point is that we are a preposterous invention, a sort of Brasilia among nations, and that this intuitive feeling for what is central and indispensable to our democratic values—a downright subversive anti-authority, anti-pretension streak and an understanding that our compact must be first and foremost social, with the appropriate statutes and forms to

flow from that—is what has helped us to beat the odds and also to redeem those crimes we have committed against each other and against other peoples."

Meg Greenfield
Washington Post Supplement
 July 4, 1976

"Off on a mountaintop on a vacation, we look back, and suddenly in the distance the America we have left behind seems bizarre and surreal."

Arthur Herzog
The B.S. Factor
 1973

[A character in a novel]: "Do you know what America is? It's a big, soapy dishpan of boredom. . . ."

Evan Hunter
Strangers When We Meet
 1958

"It is the country in the world in which you must do most things for yourself."

Henry James
The American Scene
 1907

"This nation [America], like many others, is influenced more by its feelings than reasonings."

John Jay, colonial leader
 Quoted by Richard Morris
American Heritage
 December, 1968

"A chosen country, with room enough for our descendants to the thousandth and thousandth generation."

President Thomas Jefferson
 Inaugural address
 1801

"It is by reading foreign newspapers that some careful observers have been led to the pessimistic belief that the United States today is the most cordially hated nation on earth."

Gerald W. Johnson
America-Watching
 1976

"For generations America has been the happy hunting ground of every type of quack, medical, religious, social and political."

Gerald W. Johnson
America-Watching
 1976

"He [Khrushchev] is a place on earth is as

"America is alone: Many of one mouth Dressed as one—an Only the taught spe

"Americ

"America is a cruel

"America was also myth of the Renaissance. tially extraordinary sistence. Simply. A still believed in her

"Me, I like it [America] taste. I never get tired cent it costs."

"The chief business writing up of herit

"Because America any other country delivers."

"I [a European artist] paradise. But after

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~

CJ
res:

MESSAGE TO THE AMERICAN AND SOVIET PEOPLES

Good Evening:

Today in Washington, General Secretary Gorbachev and I began meetings with two purposes in mind: first, to sign the agreement we have reached eliminating an entire class of US and Soviet intermediate-range nuclear missiles; and second, to discuss openly and honestly the broad range of other issues that confront our two nations.

I would like to reflect for a moment on how far we have come and where we have yet to go.

The people of my generation have seen an amazing parade of changes in our lifetime. Airplanes -- once held together with thin metal wire -- have given way to huge, graceful ships of the air which can carry hundreds of people in comfort. Great space-ships have spanned the solar system and taken brave astronauts to the moon. As I speak, the tiny Voyager spacecraft carries America's global message to distant galaxies while Soviet cosmonauts set new standards of human endurance.

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~

DECLASSIFIED
White House Guidelines, August 26, 1997
BY MJC NARA, Date 5/31/06

When you reach my age, you have seen so much change that nothing seems outside the realm of possibility -- given the will of the human spirit to move forward.

The people of my generation have also seen changes for the worse. The human species has applied its technical and innovative energy to waging conflict and enforcing tyranny as well. Wars are raging right now in distant lands -- Afghanistan, Nicaragua, Angola, Cambodia. The violence and horror increase with each passing year. While babies starve in Ethiopia, the very food that would save their lives is destroyed by misguided policies and continuing strife.

Indeed, the capacity for destruction now spans the globe. Must we accept this state of affairs indefinitely?

Surely we can do better. Surely we can be equally creative in finding ways to safeguard our future and improve our lives. I think we can. I think we must.

The United States and the Soviet Union have very different histories and political philosophies. We have profound political and moral disagreements that are not changed by the signing of any agreement. But we are all members of that remarkable, talented species: humankind. Our common heritage includes the

poetry of Pushkin and Walt Whitman, the music of Tchaikovsky and Gershwin, the dance artistry of Nijinsky and Martha Graham. The same creative energy that produced this heritage is able to find ways of preserving it.

When the General Secretary and I signed our names, committing our nations to comply with the terms of the Treaty on Intermediate-range Nuclear Forces, we took a step in this direction.

We signed an historic agreement to eliminate an entire class of Soviet and American nuclear missiles. This agreement is the first in human history that actually reduces the nuclear threat. All the agreements of the past decades -- well-intentioned as they were -- were flawed because, without exception, they simply limited or channeled in other directions, increases in nuclear weaponry. This approach did not stop the arms buildup; it did not reduce the threat. More and more weapons were deployed and the threat grew larger. And, to be frank, serious concerns are raised by Soviet non-compliance with some of the provisions of those agreements. A more constructive approach is needed.

No agreement does everything. But we have now embarked in what I hope will be a new direction. In addition to signing that Treaty, General Secretary Gorbachev and I have pointed the way to the vital task that must follow -- deep, stabilizing, and effectively verifiable reductions in the enormous strategic offensive nuclear arsenals that could destroy life on this planet.

And we Americans believe strongly that one way to build a safer world is through increasing reliance on defenses, which threaten no one, rather than on the threat of offensive retaliation. And that is why we are investigating the feasibility of effective strategic defenses, in the research and development program known as the Strategic Defense Initiative. The world knows that the Soviet Union itself is deeply engaged in its own strategic defense programs, so there is absolutely no reason why we should not work together to move toward a system of deterrence based more and more on defenses.

At the same time, we must not lose sight of why arms reductions are important -- that is, to reduce the risk of not just nuclear war, but all war. So while we search for ways to diminish the threat, we must also address the real causes of tension.

That is why General Secretary Gorbachev and I will also be reviewing the entire, broad spectrum of U.S.-Soviet relations. Many issues are on the agenda in addition to arms reduction, and on some of them, unfortunately, we have not made as much progress as we would like. Our relationship needs greater trust and cooperation across the board in order to improve. Only deeds will dispel the distrust.

So we will talk about human rights: issues such as the freedom to speak and worship and travel and emigrate; about regional conflicts: Afghanistan, Iran-Iraq, southern Africa and

Cambodia; and about our bilateral relations: exchanges of people and cultural values. We will also take time to discuss the world in a broader sense: the global developments that are transforming economic, political and security relations as we approach the next century. I plan to convey to the General Secretary the sincere goodwill of the American people toward the many nationalities and peoples of the Soviet Union.

The task before us will require determination and patience. We have many years of history to learn from. I do not suggest that that history be forgotten: it is instructive. There will no doubt be some setbacks along the way. But with realism and a Soviet commitment, I am confident we can make the world a better place.

Thank you and God bless you.

Foreign
Affairs
Sum 1983

Andrei Sakharov

THE DANGER OF THERMONUCLEAR WAR

AN OPEN LETTER TO DR. SIDNEY DRELL

Dear Friend:

I have read your two splendid lectures—the speech on nuclear weapons at Grace Cathedral, October 23, 1982, and the opening statement to Hearings on the Consequences of Nuclear War before the Subcommittee on Investigations and Oversight. What you say and write about the appalling dangers of nuclear war is very close to my heart and has disturbed me profoundly for many years now. I decided to address an open letter to you, feeling it necessary to take part in the discussion of this problem, one of the most important facing mankind.

In full agreement with your general theses, I will express certain considerations of a more specific nature which, I think, need to be taken into account when making decisions. These considerations in part contradict some of your statements and in part supplement and, possibly, amplify them. It seems to me that my opinion communicated here in open discussion can prove of interest in view of

Andrei Sakharov is the distinguished Soviet physicist, winner of the 1975 Nobel Peace Prize, currently in internal exile in Gorki. Among his works available in English are *Alarm and Hope* and *Collected Scientific Works*. This article was written for publication in response to the materials noted, which had been sent to him by Professor Drell of Stanford. The translation from the Russian was done by Richard Lourie and Efrem Yankelevich. Copyright © Andrei Sakharov.

Dr. Drell's speech at Grace Cathedral (in San Francisco) is unpublished but available from him on request. His opening statement before the Subcommittee on Investigations and Oversight of the House Committee on Science and Technology is contained in the Committee's record of those hearings, *The Consequences of Nuclear War on the Global Environment*, September 15, 1982, p. 6. A more comprehensive statement of Dr. Drell's views will be found in his Danz Lectures, to be published by the University of Washington Press in June 1983 under the title *Facing the Threat of Nuclear Weapons*.

The Editor is grateful to Professor Drell and to Strobe Talbott for their help in refining the translation of technical terms, and in preparing the explanatory Editor's Notes, for which of course the Editor takes responsibility.

Anatoly Shcharansky, who is wasting away in Chistopol Prison for the right to be visited by his mother and to write to her,* and Yuri Orlov who, now for a third time, has been put for six months in the punishment block of a Perm labor camp, after having been beaten unmercifully in the presence of a warden.

In December 1982 there was an amnesty to honor the U.S.S.R.'s sixtieth anniversary but, just as in 1977 and in the preceding amnesties, there was a point made of excluding prisoners of conscience. So distant is the U.S.S.R. from the principles it proclaims, a country which bears such great responsibility for the fate of the world!

IX

In conclusion I again stress how important it is that the world realize the absolute inadmissibility of nuclear war, the collective suicide of mankind. It is impossible to win a nuclear war. What is necessary is to strive, systematically though carefully, for complete nuclear disarmament based on strategic parity in conventional weapons. As long as there are nuclear weapons in the world, there must be a strategic parity of nuclear forces so that neither side will venture to embark on a limited or regional nuclear war. Genuine security is possible only when based on a stabilization of international relations, a repudiation of expansionist policies, the strengthening of international trust, openness and pluralization in the socialist societies, the observance of human rights throughout the world, the rapprochement—convergence—of the socialist and capitalist systems, and worldwide coordinated efforts to solve global problems.

February 2, 1983

Andrei Sakharov

* *Editor's Note.* At the time this Open Letter was written, Shcharansky was on a hunger strike, because he was denied all contact with his family. He has since been permitted an exchange of letters with his mother, and has ended his fast.

Zodiac birthstone for the day: Ruby (turquoise, zircon).

The day in history:

1759—Widowed Martha Dandridge Custis and George Washington were married.

1912—New Mexico admitted to U.S. as 47th state.

1941—President Franklin D. Roosevelt delivered “Four Freedoms” speech to Congress. (See today’s quotation.)

1942—Pan American Airways’ “Pacific Clipper” completed first around-the-world commercial flight in New York City; plane had left San Francisco December 2, 1941.

The day’s birthdays:

Amer. poet Carl Sandburg 1878, Galesburg, Ill.; Amer. statesman Charles Sumner 1811, Boston; Joan of Arc 1412, Domremy, France; painter Gustave Doré 1832, Strasbourg, France; actress Loretta Young, Salt Lake City; golfer Cary Middlecoff 1921, Halls, Tenn.; entertainer Danny Thomas 1914, Deerfield, Mich.

Quotation of the day:

“We look forward to a world founded upon four essential human freedoms. The first is freedom of speech and expression—everywhere in the world. The second is freedom of every person to worship God in his own way—everywhere in the world. The third is freedom from want . . . everywhere in the world. The fourth is freedom from fear . . . anywhere in the world.”—Franklin D. Roosevelt, January 6, 1941

—JANUARY 7—

Eastern Orthodox Christmas—Observed today by Greek, Russian Orthodox & some Eastern Rite Catholics.

Zodiac sign for the day: Capricorn, the goat.

Zodiac birthstone for the day: Ruby (turquoise, zircon).

The day in history:

1782—Bank of North America, first U.S. commercial bank, opened in Philadelphia, Penna.

1789—First voting under new U.S. Constitution. In first U.S. presidential election, George Washington was elected.

1830—Baltimore & Ohio Railroad Company began rail service from Baltimore, Md., using horse-drawn carriage.

1896—Fannie Farmer’s first cookbook published.

1929—Major Carl Spaatz & Captain Ira Eaker of U.S. Army Air

Force set first airplane endurance record with 150-hour 40-minute flight at Los Angeles, Calif.

1953—President Truman, in State of Union address to Congress, announced U.S. had developed H-bomb.

1959—U.S. recognized Cuba government of Fidel Castro.

1965—Indonesia became first nation to quit the United Nations; later returned.

The day’s birthdays:

U.S. President Millard Fillmore 1800, Summerhill, N.Y.; soldier Israel Putnam 1718, Danvers, Mass.; St. Bernadette 1844, Lourdes, France; cartoonist Charles Addams 1912, Westfield N.J.; baseball’s Alvin Dark 1922, Comanche, Okla.; movie magnate Adolph Zukor 1873, Ricse, Hungary.

Quotation of the day:

“All Men pretend the Licentiousness of the Press to be a publick Grievance, but it is much easier to say it is so, than to prove it . . .”—Daniel Defoe, January 7, 1704

—JANUARY 8—

Andrew Jackson Day—Louisiana holiday honors victorious commander of U.S. forces on anniversary of 1815 Battle of New Orleans.

Zodiac sign for day: Capricorn, the goat.

Zodiac birthstone for the day: Ruby (turquoise, zircon).

The day in history:

1867—Howard University adopted its present name in 1867 when it began operation as a university for Negroes, in Washington, D.C.

1918—President Woodrow Wilson, in 14-points speech to a joint session of Congress, outlined peace aims of U.S. in World War I.

1925—Igor Stravinsky made first public appearance in U.S. as conductor of New York Philharmonic in New York City.

1959—Fidel Castro entered Havana, Cuba, in triumph.

1959—Charles de Gaulle was inaugurated as President of France.

The day’s birthdays:

Novelist Wilkie Collins 1824, London; singer Elvis Presley 1935, Tupelo, Miss.; feminist-writer Simone de Beauvoir, Paris.

*INSTANT ALMANAC
of Events, Anniversaries,
Observances, Quotations,
and Birthdays
for Every Day
of the Year*

Leonard and Thelma Spinrad