

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: 05/07/1988 Radio Talk: INF (Teresa/Peter)

Box: 380

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/>

Jensen

WHITE HOUSE STAFFING MEMORANDUM

DATE: 5/5/88 ACTION/CONCURRENCE/COMMENT DUE BY: 3:00 pm today

SUBJECT: RADIO TALK: INF TREATY

	ACTION FYI			ACTION FYI	
VICE PRESIDENT	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	HOBBS	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
BAKER	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	HOOLEY	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
DUBERSTEIN	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	KRANOWITZ	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
MILLER - OMB	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	POWELL	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
BAUER	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	RANGE	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
CRIBB	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	RISQUE	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
CRIPPEN	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	RYAN	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
CULVAHOUSE	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	SPRINKEL	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
DAWSON	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	TUTTLE	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
DONATELLI	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	DOLAN	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
FITZWATER	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	_____	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
GRISCOM	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	_____	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

REMARKS: Please provide comments directly to Tony Dolan by 3:00 this afternoon, with an info copy to my office. Thanks.

TO: TONY DOLAN

May 5, 1988

RESPONSE: NSC concurs with the changes indicated.

Paul Schott Stevens
Paul Schott Stevens

cc Rhett Dawson

Rhett Dawson
Ext. 2702

(NSC/Robinson edit/ARD)
May 5, 1988
10:30 a.m.

PRESIDENTIAL RADIO TALK: I.N.F. TREATY
SATURDAY, MAY 7, 1988

My fellow Americans: Next week the full United States Senate will begin floor debate on the Treaty on Intermediate-range Nuclear Forces, known as the I.N.F. Treaty. You'll recall that Soviet General Secretary Gorbachev and I signed this Treaty at our Summit meeting in Washington last December.

The Treaty represents a landmark accomplishment -- an historic accomplishment -- because, once implemented, it will bring about the elimination of an entire class of American and Soviet nuclear missiles.

The ratification process began in January when I formally submitted the I.N.F. Treaty to the Senate. This ratification process is established in the Constitution itself, which sets forth the duty and privilege of the Senate to give its "advice and consent" before the Nation can commit itself to any treaty. Treaty ratification is an important part of our entire Constitutional process. It is vital in particular to maintaining our separation of powers. The role of the Senate, in considering the I.N.F. Treaty, is essential.

Senior officials of the Administration have been working closely with the Senate. Officials from our State and Defense Departments, our Intelligence community and our Arms Control agency have provided many hours of testimony before three separate Senate committees, painstakingly responding to the

detailed questions posed to them by the Senators on these committees.

In addition, Senators have addressed to the Administration ^{Numerous} ~~Scores of~~ letters about the Treaty -- and more than 1,200 written questions. We have provided full written responses. So you'll see that we have worked very hard to meet any Senate concerns over the Treaty. And as I've assured the Senate, we'll continue to do so.

Now the ratification process is moving out of committee to take the center of the Senate's attention -- floor debate in the historic Senate chamber. As this debate is about to begin, permit me to take a moment to review with you the Treaty's background. The I.N.F. Treaty is the result of years of hard work by American officials -- officials who, in representing you in our negotiations with the Soviet Union, held fast to the key security objectives that had been set out by the United States and our NATO Allies. ~~Our negotiators were so steadfast,~~ ^(accuracy) At one point, the Soviet Union actually walked away from the table -- and stayed away from the talks for almost a year-and-a-half.

When in early 1985 the Soviets finally returned, we repeated our call for the elimination of this entire class of U.S. and Soviet missiles -- my "zero option" proposal, first put forward all the way back in 1981. And in 1987, it was the Soviet Union that finally -- after two-and-a-half more years of negotiating -- came around to the American position.

To sum up: In the I.N.F. negotiations, we held fast to what we wanted. And we got it.

This is what comes of negotiating from strength. It's the same successful formula -- dealing from strength -- that we're applying to our other negotiations with the Soviet Union as well. And I assure you: If we don't get what we want in these other areas -- in other words, if we do not get good treaties -- there will be no treaties.

It's my hope that, in recognition of the important role they play in this process, the 100 Members of the United States Senate will now proceed expeditiously in their debate on the I.N.F. Treaty. It is, after all, a solid Treaty, carefully negotiated; a Treaty that stands on its own substantive merits; a Treaty that will enhance the security of our own country and that of our Allies in both Europe and Asia -- the two continents now threatened by the very Soviet missiles that will be removed once the Treaty is implemented.

Ratification of the Treaty will enable us to get on with the job -- the job of eliminating these nuclear missiles. It will also allow us to put into action the elaborate verification regime that we achieved in the I.N.F. Treaty. This verification regime is the most stringent in arms control history, one that will enable us to verify effectively that the Soviets are indeed complying with all of the Treaty's provisions.

I know that you, the American people, strongly support this I.N.F. Treaty. On Capitol Hill, the House of Representatives has already given the Treaty its endorsement -- by an overwhelming vote of 393 to 7.

(The President
actually
ratifies.)

Now that the Treaty is moving to floor debate in the Senate,

let the debate be vigorous and full. And let it proceed without
delay. For I'm confident that the final vote will indeed ^{give consent to ratification} ~~ratify~~

of this historic Treaty, permitting the United States ^{and} ~~to join~~ the
Soviet Union ^{to} ~~in~~ taking ^e an historic step ^{toward a safer} ~~for world~~ peace.

Until next week, thanks for listening and God bless you.

(NSC/Robinson edit/ARD)

May 5, 1988

7:45 p.m.

FR TR

PRESIDENTIAL RADIO TALK: I.N.F. TREATY
SATURDAY, MAY 7, 1988

My fellow Americans: Next week the full United States Senate is expected to begin floor debate on the Treaty on Intermediate-range Nuclear Forces, known as the I.N.F. Treaty. You'll recall that Soviet General Secretary Gorbachev and I signed this Treaty at our Summit meeting in Washington last December.

The Treaty represents a landmark accomplishment -- an historic accomplishment -- because, once implemented, it will bring about the elimination of an entire class of American and Soviet nuclear missiles.

Before our Nation can commit itself to a treaty, our Constitution provides that the Senate must give its advice and consent. Therefore, last January I formally submitted the I.N.F. Treaty to the Senate for its consideration. The duty of the Senate in giving its advice and consent to treaties is vital to maintaining our separation of powers; and the role of the Senate, in considering the I.N.F. Treaty, is essential.

Senior officials of the Administration have been working closely with the Senate. Officials from our State and Defense Departments, our Intelligence community and our Arms Control Agency have provided many hours of testimony before three separate Senate committees, painstakingly responding to the detailed questions posed to them by the Senators on these committees.

In addition, Senators have addressed to the Administration numerous letters about the Treaty -- and more than 1,200 written questions. We have provided full written responses. So you'll see that we have worked very hard to meet any Senate concerns over the Treaty. And as I've assured the Senate, we'll continue to do so.

Now that the Senate Foreign Relations Committee has approved the I.N.F. Treaty, the entire Senate will be called on to discharge its constitutional responsibility to provide its advice and consent to the I.N.F. Treaty. As this debate is about to begin in the historic Senate chamber, permit me to take a moment to review with you the Treaty's background. The I.N.F. Treaty is the result of years of hard work by American officials -- officials who, in representing you in our negotiations with the Soviet Union, held fast to the key security objectives that had been set out by the United States and our NATO Allies. At one point the Soviet Union actually walked away from the table -- and stayed away from the talks for almost a year-and-a-half.

When in early 1985 the Soviets finally returned, we repeated our call for the elimination of this entire class of U.S. and Soviet missiles -- my "zero option" proposal, first put forward all the way back in 1981. And in 1987, it was the Soviet Union that finally -- after two-and-a-half more years of negotiating -- came around to the American position.

To sum up: In the I.N.F. negotiations, we held fast to what we wanted. And we got it.

This is what comes of negotiating from strength. It's the same successful formula -- dealing from strength -- that we're applying to our other negotiations with the Soviet Union as well. And I assure you: If we don't get what we want in these other areas -- in other words, if we do not get good treaties -- there will be no treaties.

It's my hope that, in recognition of the important role they play in this process, the 100 Members of the United States Senate will now proceed expeditiously in their debate on the I.N.F. Treaty. It is, after all, a solid Treaty, carefully negotiated; a Treaty that stands on its own substantive merits; a Treaty that will enhance the security of our own country and that of our European and Asia Allies now threatened by the very Soviet missiles that will be removed once the Treaty is implemented.

Senate approval of the Treaty will enable us to get on with the job of eliminating these nuclear missiles. It will also allow us to put into action the elaborate verification regime that we achieved in the I.N.F. Treaty. The most stringent in arms control history, it will enable us to verify effectively that the Soviets are indeed complying with all of the Treaty's provisions.

I know that you, the American people, strongly support this I.N.F. Treaty and on Capitol Hill, the House of Representatives has already given the Treaty its endorsement -- by an overwhelming vote of 393 to 7.

Now that the Treaty is moving to floor debate in the Senate, let the debate be vigorous and full. And let it proceed without

delay. For I'm confident that the final vote will indeed give advice and consent to this historic Treaty, the historic step toward a safer peace.

Until next week, thanks for listening and God bless you.

THE WHITE HOUSE

WASHINGTON

Received SS

1988 MAY -5 PM 5:33

Jeresa

May 5, 1988

MEMORANDUM FOR ANTHONY R. DOLAN
DEPUTY ASSISTANT TO THE PRESIDENT AND
DIRECTOR OF SPEECHWRITING

FROM: ARTHUR B. CULVAHOUSE, JR.
COUNSEL TO THE PRESIDENT

Original Signed by ABC

SUBJECT: Radio Address: INF Treaty

Counsel's office has reviewed the above-referenced radio address, and we are concerned about characterizing the Senate's advice and consent role as part of the ratification process. The Constitution does not refer to the "ratification" of treaties. Rather "ratification" is used under international law to describe the formal exchange of instruments whereby a treaty is brought into effect. Only the President can exchange these instruments, i.e., ratify the treaty. Therefore, we believe it is inaccurate to state that the ratification process begins with submission of the INF Treaty to the Senate; and that the Senate has a constitutional role as part of the ratification process. With these overall considerations in mind, we recommend the following changes:

1. At page 1, paragraph 3, we recommend the following substitution:

Before our Nation can commit itself to a treaty, our Constitution provides that the Senate must give its advice and consent. Therefore, last January I formally submitted the INF Treaty to the Senate for its consideration. The duty of the Senate in giving its advice and consent to treaties is vital to maintaining our separation of powers; and the role of the Senate, in considering the INF Treaty, is essential.

2. At page 2, paragraph 2, we recommend that the first sentence be revised as follows:

Now that the Senate Foreign Relations Committee has approved the INF Treaty, the entire Senate will be called on to discharge its constitutional responsibility to provide its advice and consent

to the INF Treaty. As this debate is about to begin in the historic Senate chamber, permit me to take a moment to review with you the Treaty's background.

3. At page 3, paragraph 3, we recommend that the first sentence be revised as follows:

NO

Senate approval of the Treaty will enable us to get on with the job -- the job of implementing the Treaty and eliminating these nuclear missiles.

4. At page 4, we recommend that the final sentence be revised to read as follows:

NO

I am confident that the Senate will indeed provide its advice and consent to this historic Treaty, permitting the United States to join the Soviet Union in taking an historic step for world peace.

Except as noted above, we have no legal objection to the delivery of this radio address. Thank you for bringing this matter to our attention.

cc: Rhett B. Dawson

Jeresa

(NSC/Robinson edit/ARD)
May 5, 1988
4:30 p.m. RR

PRESIDENTIAL RADIO TALK: I.N.F. TREATY
SATURDAY, MAY 7, 1988

My fellow Americans: Next week the full United States Senate is expected to begin floor debate on the Treaty on Intermediate-range Nuclear Forces, known as the I.N.F. Treaty. You'll recall that Soviet General Secretary Gorbachev and I signed this Treaty at our Summit meeting in Washington last December.

The Treaty represents a landmark accomplishment -- an historic accomplishment -- because, once implemented, it will bring about the elimination of an entire class of American and Soviet nuclear missiles.

The ratification process began in January when I formally submitted the I.N.F. Treaty to the Senate. This ratification process is established in the Constitution itself, which sets forth the duty and privilege of the Senate to give its "Advice and Consent" before the Nation can commit itself to any treaty. Treaty ratification is an important part of our entire Constitutional process. It is vital in particular to maintaining our separation of powers. The role of the Senate, in considering the I.N.F. Treaty, is essential.

Senior officials of the Administration have been working closely with the Senate. Officials from our State and Defense Departments, our Intelligence community and our Arms Control Agency have provided many hours of testimony before three separate Senate committees, painstakingly responding to the

detailed questions posed to them by the Senators on these committees.

In addition, Senators have addressed to the Administration numerous letters about the Treaty -- and more than 1,200 written questions. We have provided full written responses. So you'll see that we have worked very hard to meet any Senate concerns over the Treaty. And as I've assured the Senate, we'll continue to do so.

Now the ratification process is moving out of committee to take the center of the Senate's attention -- floor debate in the historic Senate chamber. As this debate is about to begin, permit me to take a moment to review with you the Treaty's background. The I.N.F. Treaty is the result of years of hard work by American officials -- officials who, in representing you in our negotiations with the Soviet Union, held fast to the key security objectives that had been set out by the United States and our NATO Allies. At one point the Soviet Union actually walked away from the table -- and stayed away from the talks for almost a year-and-a-half.

When in early 1985 the Soviets finally returned, we repeated our call for the elimination of this entire class of U.S. and Soviet missiles -- my "zero option" proposal, first put forward all the way back in 1981. And in 1987, it was the Soviet Union that finally -- after two-and-a-half more years of negotiating -- came around to the American position.

To sum up: In the I.N.F. negotiations, we held fast to what we wanted. And we got it.

This is what comes of negotiating from strength. It's the same successful formula -- dealing from strength -- that we're applying to our other negotiations with the Soviet Union as well. And I assure you: If we don't get what we want in these other areas -- in other words, if we do not get good treaties -- there will be no treaties.

It's my hope that, in recognition of the important role they play in this process, the 100 Members of the United States Senate will now proceed expeditiously in their debate on the I.N.F. Treaty. It is, after all, a solid Treaty, carefully negotiated; a Treaty that stands on its own substantive merits; a Treaty that will enhance the security of our own country and that of our Allies in both Europe and Asia -- the two continents now threatened by the very Soviet missiles that will be removed once the Treaty is implemented.

Ratification of the Treaty will enable us to get on with the job -- the job of eliminating these nuclear missiles. It will also allow us to put into action the elaborate verification regime that we achieved in the I.N.F. Treaty. This verification regime is the most stringent in arms control history, one that will enable us to verify effectively that the Soviets are indeed complying with all of the Treaty's provisions.

I know that you, the American people, strongly support this I.N.F. Treaty. On Capitol Hill, the House of Representatives has already given the Treaty its endorsement -- by an overwhelming vote of 393 to 7.

Now that the Treaty is moving to floor debate in the Senate, let the debate be vigorous and full. And let it proceed without delay. For I'm confident that the final vote will indeed give consent to ratification of this historic Treaty, permitting the United States and the Soviet Union to take an historic step toward a safer peace.

Until next week, thanks for listening and God bless you.

WHITE HOUSE STAFFING MEMORANDUM

DATE: 5/5/88 ACTION/CONCURRENCE/COMMENT DUE BY: 3:00 pm today

SUBJECT: RADIO TALK: INF TREATY

	ACTION FYI			ACTION FYI	
VICE PRESIDENT	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	HOBBS	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
BAKER	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	HOOLEY	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
DUBERSTEIN	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	KRANOWITZ	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
MILLER - OMB	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	POWELL	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
BAUER	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	RANGE	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
CRIBB	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	RISQUE	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
CRIPPEN	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	RYAN	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
CULVAHOUSE	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	SPRINKEL	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
DAWSON	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	TUTTLE	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
DONATELLI	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	DOLAN	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
FITZWATER	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
GRISCOM	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

REMARKS: Please provide comments directly to Tony Dolan by 3:00 this afternoon, with an info copy to my office. Thanks.

RESPONSE: NSC concurs with the changes indicated.

Paul Schott Stevens

Rhett Dawson
Ext. 2702

(NSC/Robinson edit/ARD)
May 5, 1988
10:30 a.m.

MASTER

PRESIDENTIAL RADIO TALK: I.N.F. TREATY
SATURDAY, MAY 7, 1988

My fellow Americans: Next week the full United States Senate ^{is expected to} ~~will~~ begin floor debate on the Treaty on Intermediate-range Nuclear Forces, known as the I.N.F. Treaty. You'll recall that Soviet General Secretary Gorbachev and I signed this Treaty at our Summit meeting in Washington last December. X

The Treaty represents a landmark accomplishment -- an historic accomplishment -- because, once implemented, it will bring about the elimination of an entire class of American and Soviet nuclear missiles.

The ratification process began in January when I formally submitted the I.N.F. Treaty to the Senate. This ratification process is established in the Constitution itself, which sets forth the duty and privilege of the Senate to give its "advice and consent" before the Nation can commit itself to any treaty. Treaty ratification is an important part of our entire Constitutional process. It is vital in particular to maintaining our separation of powers. The role of the Senate, in considering the I.N.F. Treaty, is essential. X

Senior officials of the Administration have been working closely with the Senate. Officials from our State and Defense Departments, our Intelligence community and our Arms Control agency have provided many hours of testimony before three separate Senate committees, painstakingly responding to the X

detailed questions posed to them by the Senators on these committees.

In addition, Senators have addressed to the Administration ^{NUMEROUS} ~~scores of~~ letters about the Treaty -- and more than 1,200 written questions. We have provided full written responses. So you'll see that we have worked very hard to meet any Senate concerns over the Treaty. And as I've assured the Senate, we'll continue to do so.

Now the ratification process is moving out of committee to take the center of the Senate's attention -- floor debate in the historic Senate chamber. As this debate is about to begin, permit me to take a moment to review with you the Treaty's background. The I.N.F. Treaty is the result of years of hard work by American officials -- officials who, in representing you in our negotiations with the Soviet Union, held fast to the key security objectives that had been set out by the United States and our NATO Allies. ~~Our negotiators were so steadfast,~~ At one point, the Soviet Union actually walked away from the table -- and stayed away from the talks for almost a year-and-a-half.

When in early 1985 the Soviets finally returned, we repeated our call for the elimination of this entire class of U.S. and Soviet missiles -- my "zero option" proposal, first put forward all the way back in 1981. And in 1987, it was the Soviet Union that finally -- after two-and-a-half more years of negotiating -- came around to the American position.

To sum up: In the I.N.F. negotiations, we held fast to what we wanted. And we got it.

This is what comes of negotiating from strength. It's the same successful formula -- dealing from strength -- that we're applying to our other negotiations with the Soviet Union as well. And I assure you: If we don't get what we want in these other areas -- in other words, if we do not get good treaties -- there will be no treaties.

It's my hope that, in recognition of the important role they play in this process, the 100 Members of the United States Senate will now proceed expeditiously in their debate on the I.N.F. Treaty. It is, after all, a solid Treaty, carefully negotiated; a Treaty that stands on its own substantive merits; a Treaty that will enhance the security of our own country and that of our Allies in both Europe and Asia -- the two continents now threatened by the very Soviet missiles that will be removed once the Treaty is implemented.

Ratification of the Treaty will enable us to get on with the job -- the job of eliminating these nuclear missiles. It will also allow us to put into action the elaborate verification regime that we achieved in the I.N.F. Treaty. This verification regime is the most stringent in arms control history, one that will enable us to verify effectively that the Soviets are indeed complying with all of the Treaty's provisions.

I know that you, the American people, strongly support this I.N.F. Treaty. On Capitol Hill, the House of Representatives has already given the Treaty its endorsement -- by an overwhelming vote of 393 to 7.

Now that the Treaty is moving to floor debate in the Senate,
let the debate be vigorous and full. And let it proceed without
delay. For I'm confident that the final vote will indeed ^{give consent to ratification} ~~ratify~~
^{and} of this historic Treaty, permitting the United States ~~to join~~ the
Soviet Union ^{to} ~~in~~ taking ^e an historic step ^{toward a safer} ~~for world~~ peace.

Until next week, thanks for listening and God bless you.

NATIONAL SECURITY COUNCIL EXECUTIVE SECRETARY REFERRAL

TIME STAMP

88 MAY 5 AM: 27

SYSTEM I LOG NUMBER: 3416

(FIRST DRAFT OF REMARKS)

ACTION OFFICER: _____

DUE: IMMEDIATELY

- Prepare Memo Stevens to Dawson
- Prepare Memo Stevens to Dolan W/ INFO DAWSON
- Prepare Memo Stevens to _____
- Prepare Memo _____ to _____

URGENT

*** PUT RESPECTIVE STAFF OFFICER'S NAME IN MARGIN BESIDE CHANGES.

CONCURRENCES/COMMENTS*

DUE: IMMEDIATELY

*PHONE to action officer at ext. 5010

- | | | |
|---|---|---|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> FYI
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Batjer | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> FYI
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Heiser | <input type="checkbox"/> FYI
<input type="checkbox"/> Paal |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Bemis | <input type="checkbox"/> Henhoeffer | <input type="checkbox"/> Perle |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Brooks | <input type="checkbox"/> Herbst | <input type="checkbox"/> Porter |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Burns | <input type="checkbox"/> Howard | <input type="checkbox"/> Reger |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Childress | <input type="checkbox"/> Howland | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Rodman |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Cobb | <input type="checkbox"/> Jameson | <input type="checkbox"/> Rosenberg |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Cockell | <input type="checkbox"/> Jenkins | <input type="checkbox"/> Ross |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Cohen | <input type="checkbox"/> Kelly, B. | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Rostow |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Collins | <input type="checkbox"/> Kelly, J. | <input type="checkbox"/> Saunders |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Danzansky | <input type="checkbox"/> Kimberling | <input type="checkbox"/> Scharfen |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Dean | <input type="checkbox"/> Kissell | <input type="checkbox"/> Snider |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Dekok | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Ledsky | <input type="checkbox"/> Sorzano |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Donley | <input type="checkbox"/> Lewis | <input type="checkbox"/> Steiner |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Douglass | <input type="checkbox"/> Linhard | <input type="checkbox"/> Tahir-Kheli |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Ermarth | <input type="checkbox"/> Mahley | <input type="checkbox"/> Tarbell |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Farrar | <input type="checkbox"/> Matthews | <input type="checkbox"/> Tice |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Flower | <input type="checkbox"/> McNamara | <input type="checkbox"/> Tillman |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Fortier | <input type="checkbox"/> Melby | <input type="checkbox"/> Tobey |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Frazier | <input type="checkbox"/> Miskel | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <u>POPADIUK</u> |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Grimes | <input type="checkbox"/> Oakley | <input type="checkbox"/> _____ |

INFORMATION

Stevens

Powell (advance)

Courtney

Negropono (advance)

Exec. Sec. Desk

Secretariat

Logged By AC

Return to Secretariat

Jerusa

(NSC/Robinson edit/ARD)
May 5, 1988
10:30 a.m. SS

PRESIDENTIAL RADIO TALK: I.N.F. TREATY
SATURDAY, MAY 7, 1988

My fellow Americans: Next week the full United States Senate ^{is expected to} begin floor debate on the Treaty on Intermediate-range Nuclear Forces, known as the I.N.F. Treaty. You'll recall that Soviet General Secretary Gorbachev and I signed this Treaty at our Summit meeting in Washington last December.

The Treaty represents a landmark accomplishment -- an historic accomplishment -- because, once implemented, it will bring about the elimination of an entire class of American and Soviet nuclear missiles.

The ratification process began in January when I formally submitted the I.N.F. Treaty to the Senate. This ratification process is established in the Constitution itself, which sets forth the duty and privilege of the Senate to give its "advice and consent" before the Nation can commit itself to any treaty. Treaty ratification is an important part of our entire Constitutional process. It is vital in particular to maintaining our separation of powers. The role of the Senate, in considering the I.N.F. Treaty, is essential.

Senior officials of the Administration have been working closely with the Senate. Officials from our State and Defense Departments, our Intelligence community and our Arms Control agency have provided many hours of testimony before three separate Senate committees, painstakingly responding to the

*Wed expected
124-3121
XP
12/8/89*

*DD
2/8/87*

*PP
11/9/88
p.50*

*Const
11*

X

X
X

X

detailed questions posed to them by the Senators on these committees.

See over
In addition, Senators have addressed to the Administration scores of letters about the Treaty -- and more than 1,200 written questions. We have provided full written responses. So you'll see that we have worked very hard to meet any Senate concerns over the Treaty. And as I've assured the Senate, we'll continue to do so.

Now the ratification process is moving out of committee to take the center of the Senate's attention -- floor debate in the historic Senate chamber. As this debate is about to begin, permit me to take a moment to review with you the Treaty's background. The I.N.F. Treaty is the result of years of hard work by American officials -- officials who, in representing you in our negotiations with the Soviet Union, held fast to the key security objectives that had been set out by the United States and our NATO Allies. ~~Our negotiators were so steadfast,~~ at one point the Soviet Union actually walked away from the table -- and stayed away from the talks for almost a year-and-a-half. *X*

Steiner
11/23/83
When in early 1985 the Soviets finally returned, we repeated our call for the elimination of this entire class of U.S. and Soviet missiles -- my "zero option" proposal, first put forward all the way back in 1981. And in 1987, it was the Soviet Union that finally -- after two-and-a-half more years of negotiating -- came around to the American position.

11/3/81
To sum up: In the I.N.F. negotiations, we held fast to what we wanted. And we got it.

This is what comes of negotiating from strength. It's the same successful formula -- dealing from strength -- that we're applying to our other negotiations with the Soviet Union as well. And I assure you: If we don't get what we want in these other areas -- in other words, if we do not get good treaties -- there will be no treaties.

It's my hope that, in recognition of the important role they play in this process, the 100 Members of the United States Senate will now proceed expeditiously in their debate on the I.N.F. Treaty. It is, after all, a solid Treaty, carefully negotiated; a Treaty that stands on its own substantive merits; a Treaty that will enhance the security of our own country and that of our Allies in both Europe and Asia -- the two continents now threatened by the very Soviet missiles that will be removed once the Treaty is implemented.

Ratification of the Treaty will enable us to get on with the job -- the job of eliminating these nuclear missiles. It will also allow us to put into action the elaborate verification regime that we achieved in the I.N.F. Treaty. This verification regime is the most stringent in arms control history, one that will enable us to verify effectively that the Soviets are indeed complying with all of the Treaty's provisions.

I know that you, the American people, strongly support this I.N.F. Treaty. On Capitol Hill, the House of Representatives has already given the Treaty its endorsement -- by an overwhelming vote of 393 to 7.

steiner

Now that the Treaty is moving to floor debate in the Senate,
let the debate be vigorous and full. And let it proceed without

delay. For I'm confident that the final vote will indeed ~~provide~~ ^{give} consent ~~to~~ ^{and} ~~ratify~~ ^{and the Soviet Union to} ~~take~~ ^{take}
~~to~~ ^{to ratification of this} this historic Treaty, permitting the United States to join the ~~Soviet Union in taking an historic step~~ ^{toward a safer} ~~for world peace.~~

Until next week, thanks for listening and God bless you.

~~Stein~~
Stein

NOTE FROM: Steven Steiner SUBJECT: Saturday Radio Address --
Please Print

My fellow Americans:

Next week the full United States Senate will ^{begin floor} ~~undertake its~~ debate

~~on the Senate floor~~ ^{on} of the Treaty on Intermediate-range Nuclear

Forces, known as the INF Treaty. You ^{will} recall that Soviet

General Secretary Gorbachev and I signed this Treaty at our

Summit meeting in Washington last December.

① The Treaty ^{represents} is a landmark accomplishment ^{-- an historic accomplishment --} because, once ~~it is~~ implemented, it will bring about the elimination of an entire class of ^{American} ~~US~~ and Soviet nuclear missiles.

~~The role of the Senate is to give its advice and consent on the ratification of the Treaty, which is necessary before it can be implemented.~~

The ratification ^{process} ~~effort~~ began ^{in January} when I formally submitted the ^{INF} Treaty to the Senate. ^{INF Treaty} ~~in January~~ Treaty ratification

is an important part of our ^{entire} Constitutional process. ^{It is vital in particular to} our separation ^{of powers} of powers. ^{So as it is with any treaty, the role of} and the Senate ^{has an essential role to play} ~~has an essential role to play.~~

④ Senior officials of my Administration have ^{been working} ~~worked~~ closely with the Senate ⁱⁿ ~~its consideration of the INF Treaty.~~ Officials from our State and Defense Departments, our Intelligence Community and our Arms Control agency have provided many hours of testimony before three separate Senate committees, ~~and have~~ painstakingly responded ^{to} to the detailed questions posed to them by the Senators on these committees.

④ In addition, Senators have addressed to the Administration ^{-- and more than 1200 written questions.} ~~over 1200 written questions and scores of letters about the Treaty,~~ ^{everyone} ~~and we have provided full written responses to all of them.~~ ^{So you'll see that}

have worked very hard to meet any Senate concerns over the Treaty. ^{and as I've assured the Senators we'll} ~~and are continuing to do so.~~

Now the ratification process is moving out of committee to take the center of the Senate's attention - floor debate in the Historic Senate chamber.

As ^{this} the debate on the Senate floor is about to begin, ^{permit} allow me to take a moment to review with you the Treaty's background. ~~Remind you how we achieved this historic Treaty. It is the result~~

of years of hard work by the American officials who represented you in our negotiations with the Soviet Union and held fast to the key security objectives which had been set out by the ~~US~~ ^{United States} and our NATO Allies. ~~The Soviet Union even walked away from the table at one point~~ ^{Our negotiators were so steadfast, at one point} and stayed away from the talks for almost a year and a half.

^{in early 1985} When they ^{Soviets} finally returned, in early 1985, we ^{repeated} reiterated our call for the elimination of this entire class of US and Soviet missiles -- my "zero option" proposal, ^{first put forward all the way back in} 1981. And it was the Soviet Union which finally ^{in 1987} after two and a half more years of negotiating, came around to the American position.

To sum up:

Thus in the INF negotiations, we held fast to what we wanted, and we got it.

This is ^{what comes} the result of negotiating from strength, and ^{-- dealing from strength --} it is the same successful formula that we are applying to our other negotiations with the Soviet Union as well. ^{I assure you!} And if we don't get what we want in these other areas, in other words if we do not get good treaties, there will be NO treaties.

It's my

hope that the 100 members of the United States Senate in recognition of the important role they play in this process, will now proceed expeditiously in their debate on the INF Treaty. It is, after all, a solid Treaty, carefully negotiated, ^{a Treaty that} which stands on its own substantive merits, ^{a Treaty that} and which will enhance the security of our ^{own} country and ^{that} of our Allies in both Europe and Asia -- the two continents now threatened by the ^{vers} Soviet missiles ^{that} which will

be removed once the Treaty ^{is} ~~can be~~ implemented. [¶] Ratification of the Treaty will enable us to get on with the job ^{of eliminating these} nuclear missiles. It will also allow us to put into action the elaborate verification regime ^{that} ~~which~~ we achieved in ^{the INF} ~~this~~ Treaty. ^{This verification regime is} the most stringent in arms control history, ^{one that} ~~which~~ will enable us to verify effectively that the Soviets are complying with ^{all of} ~~the~~ Treaty's provisions. ^{indeed}

I know that you, ^{INF} The American people, strongly support this Treaty, ^{On Capitol Hill,} and the House of Representatives has ^{already} given the Treaty its endorsement -- by an overwhelming vote of ~~We hope the Senate too will soon give its approval.~~ ^{[researcher, please insert vote count].}

¶ Now that the Treaty is moving to floor debate in the Senate, let the debate be vigorous and full. And let it proceed without delay. For I'm confident that the final vote will indeed ratify this historic Treaty, permitting the United States to join the Soviet Union in taking an historic step for world peace.

¶ Until next week, thanks for listening and God bless you.

INSERT I.

This ratification process is established in the Constitution itself, which sets it forth as the duty and privilege of the Senate to give its "advise and consent" before the Nation can commit itself to ~~any~~ any treaty.

THE WHITE HOUSE

WASHINGTON

May 4, 1988

MEMORANDUM FOR TONY DOLAN
SPEECHWRITERS

FROM:

RHETT DAWSON *RD*

SUBJECT:

Saturday Radio Address, May 7th

The topic for this week's radio address is the INF treaty. As you know the treaty is expected to be taken up by the Senate on Wednesday, May 11. The President's remarks should emphasize that the treaty was something sought in a long process. This process required our European allies and ourselves to make the most determined of efforts. In short, the remarks should convey that we were diligent in putting together the provisions of the treaty. The message we convey to the Senate as to how quickly it gives advice and consent should be a little nudge but not a push. We should not mention that we want Senate action completed by the time of the Moscow summit. We should express willingness to work with the Senate to resolve any issues.

Finally, the address should avoid tying INF ratification to our ability to achieve other arms control measures. Steve Steiner of the NSC staff has volunteered to work with you on these remarks. You may also want to consult with Legislative Affairs.

;

cc: Alan Kranowitz
Steve Steiner