

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: 06/03/1988 Guildhall, London (4)

Box: 385

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/>

RO

WHITE HOUSE STAFFING MEMORANDUM

DATE: 05/16/88 ACTION/CONCURRENCE/COMMENT DUE BY: C.O.B. Friday 05/20/88

SUBJECT: PRESIDENTIAL ADDRESS: FOREIGN AFFAIRS ORGANIZATION
LONDON, ENGLAND
(05/16 4:00 p.m. draft)

	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 checked="" 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"/>	COURTEMANCHE	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
GRISCOM	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

REMARKS:

Please provide any comments/recommendations directly to Tony Dolan by close of business on Friday, May 20th, with an info copy to my office. Thanks.

RESPONSE:

- ① Reference to INF on page 6 detracts from the dramatic emphasis on INF on page 8 (yesterday, at - GMT.)
- ② The G.I. vs. cow comparison on page 3, even though told as a third-person story in a humorous context, seems inappropriate.

Rhett Dawson
Ext. 2702

50A-17May

glad to be in England once again. After a long journey, we feel among friends; and with all our hearts we thank you for having us here.

Such feelings are, of course, especially appropriate to this occasion; we are here in part to celebrate the special relationship between the United States and Great Britain, a relationship at the center of the NATO alliance.

This hardly means we've always had perfect understanding or unanimity on every issue. When I first visited Mrs. Thatcher at the British Embassy in 1981, she mischievously reminded me that the huge portrait dominating the grand staircase was none other than that of George the III; though she did graciously concede that today most of her countrymen would agree with Jefferson that a little revolution is now and then a good thing. I'm also reminded of a time when Sir Winston, who wasn't always as sedate as he appears over there (points to statue of seated, reflective Churchill), grew so exasperated with American diplomacy he called our Secretary of State at a press conference, quote: "the only case I know of a bull carrying his own china closet with him."

Then too, during his religious talks in our country, the English Jesuit and author, Reverend Barnard Basset, delights his American audiences by revealing some of the naughty things you used to say about our G.I.'s, when they peacefully invaded your island 44 years ago so that together we could not-so-peacefully invade Nazi-held Europe. "What is the difference," one of your naughty stories went "between a cow chewing his cud and a G.I. chewing gum?" Answer: "The look of intelligence on the cow's face."

freezes, opposing deployment of counterbalancing and deterrent weapons such as intermediate-range missiles or the more recent concept of strategic defense systems.

These same voices ridiculed the notion of going beyond arms control -- the hope of doing something more than merely establishing artificial limits within which the arms races continues almost unabated. Arms reduction would never work, they said, and when the Soviets left the negotiating table in Geneva for 11 months, they proclaimed disaster.

And yet it was NATO's zero-option plan, much maligned when first proposed, that is the basis for the I.N.F. treaty [the final papers of which Mr. Gorbachev and I signed just 24 hours ago;] the first treaty ever that did not just control arms but reduced them and, yes, actually eliminated an entire class of nuclear weapons. Similarly, just as these voices urged retreat or slow withdrawal at every point of Communist expansion, we have seen what a forward strategy for freedom and direct aid to those struggling for self-determination can achieve. For 2 weeks now, Soviet troops have been departing Afghanistan and there is hope of similar change in other regional conflicts.

This treaty and the development in Afghanistan are momentous events. Not conclusive. But momentous.

And that is why although history will, as it has about the skeptics and naysayers of any time, duly note that we too heard voices of denial and doubt, it is the voices of hope and strength that will be best remembered. And here I want to say that through all the troubles of the last decade, one such voice, a voice of eloquence and firmness, a voice that proclaimed proudly

achievement and a startling growth of democracies and free markets all across the globe -- in short, an expansion of the frontiers of freedom and a lessening of the chances of war. I believe history will record our time as the time of the renaissance of the democracies; a time when faced with those twin threats of nuclear terror and totalitarian rule that so darkened this century, the democracies ignored the voices of retreat and despair and found deep within themselves the resources for a renewal of strength and purpose.

So, it is within this context of gratitude to you, Prime Minister, to the British people and to all our valiant allies that I report to you now on events in Moscow.

Yesterday, at ___ Greenwich time, Mr. Gorbachev and I [signed the final papers of the I.N.F. treaty.] (Report on INF and START and other negotiations.)

Now, part of the realism and candor we were determined to bring to negotiations with Soviets meant refusing to put all the weight of these negotiations and our bilateral relationship on the single difficult issue of arms negotiations. We have understood full well that the agenda of discussion must be broadened to deal with the more fundamental differences between us. This is the meaning of realism. As I never tire of saying, nations do not mistrust each other because they are armed, they are armed because they mistrust each other.

So other items on the agenda dealt with critical issues like regional conflicts, human rights and people-to-people exchanges with regard to regional conflicts, here too, we can see momentous progress. We are now in the third week of the pull out of Soviet

THE WHITE HOUSE

WASHINGTON

May 17, 1988

80

MEMORANDUM FOR TONY DOLAN

FROM

JIM HOOLEY *JH*

SUBJECT

LONDON/GUILDHALL SPEECH COMMENTS

As you requested, I read the Guildhall speech very carefully. My first reaction is that you can always tell a Tony Dolan speech; the reflective and relaxed tone are reminiscent of the final speech of the 1986 campaign.

1. I believe that the very first time that the President used the phrase "zero option" to describe his plan for arms reduction (although he had made the proposal several times earlier) was in the British Parliament speech in 1982. My office researched this last year, and I will try to dig the report out of the files; Tom may have a copy as well.

At any rate, if this is true, you might want to point it out on page 6, where you refer to the zero option plan, as a small footnote.

2. (Shades of Bill Henkel): the speech is awfully long--extremely good, in my humble opinion--but long. There are some great stories in the beginning which set the tone. But by the time you fill in all the holes (reports on Moscow, INF, human rights, etc.), it will be pages longer.

I don't offer this as an editorial comment, but as a practical matter. That is, with Tom's guidance the speech was budgeted 25 minutes. At this point, before insertions, it is 16 pages long, or 24-32 minutes (depending on whether you figure a minute-and-a-half or two minutes per page). Since the speech cannot begin any earlier than scheduled, since it is timed for live network television here at home, anything over 25 minutes will set our departure for the U.S. back. Tom will have to address whether or not this is a problem or not, but I am going to try to ascertain whether or not this would adversely affect our plan for live television coverage of the arrival statement at Andrews.

3. Finally, let's talk to Tom about some of the visuals which are possible. I'm sure that you and I--and Tom--will have the same instinctive ideas about this one.

4. I think the Tennyson line is "to seek a newer world."

cc: T. Griscom
R. Dawson

THE WHITE HOUSE
WASHINGTON

FO



May 20, 1988

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

FROM: PHILLIP D. BRADY
DEPUTY COUNSEL TO THE PRESIDENT

SUBJECT: Presidential Address: Foreign Affairs
Organization, London, England

Counsel's office has reviewed the above-referenced Presidential address, and while we have no legal objection to its delivery, we recommend that, if the bracketed material at pages 6 and 8 is included, it be made clear that implementation of the INF Treaty will take effect only after the Treaty enters into force. As we indicated earlier, this is separate and distinct from the act of ratification. See Memorandum from C. Dean McGrath, Jr., to Anthony R. Dolan (May 20, 1988) and Memorandum from Phillip D. Brady to Anthony R. Dolan (May 20, 1988).

We have also marked for your consideration minor editorial changes at pages 6, 8, 11, and 13, copies attached.

Attachment

cc: Rhett B. Dawson

freezes, opposing deployment of counterbalancing and deterrent weapons such as intermediate-range missiles or the more recent concept of strategic defense systems.

These same voices ridiculed the notion of going beyond arms control -- the hope of doing something more than merely establishing artificial limits within which the arms races continues almost unabated. Arms reduction would never work, they said, and when the Soviets ^{Union} left the negotiating table in Geneva for 11 months, they proclaimed disaster.

And yet it was NATO's zero-option plan, much maligned when first proposed, that is the basis for the I.N.F. treaty [the final papers of which Mr. Gorbachev and I signed just 24 hours ago;] the first treaty ever that did not just control arms but reduced them and, yes, actually eliminated an entire class of nuclear weapons. Similarly, just as these voices urged retreat or slow withdrawal at every point of Communist expansion, we have seen what a forward strategy for freedom and direct aid to those struggling for self-determination can achieve. For 2 weeks now, Soviet troops have been departing Afghanistan and there is hope of similar change in other regional conflicts.

This treaty and the development in Afghanistan are momentous events. Not conclusive. But momentous.

And that is why although history will, as it has about the skeptics and naysayers of any time, duly note that we too heard voices of denial and doubt, it is the voices of hope and strength that will be best remembered. And here I want to say that through all the troubles of the last decade, one such voice, a voice of eloquence and firmness, a voice that proclaimed proudly

achievement and a startling growth of democracies and free markets all across the globe -- in short, an expansion of the frontiers of freedom and a lessening of the chances of war. I believe history will record our time as the time of the renaissance of the democracies; a time when faced with those twin threats of nuclear terror and totalitarian rule that so darkened this century, the democracies ignored the voices of retreat and despair and found deep within themselves the resources for a renewal of strength and purpose.

So, it is within this context of gratitude to you, Prime Minister, to the British people and to all our valiant allies that I report to you now on events in Moscow.

Yesterday, at ___ Greenwich time, Mr. Gorbachev and I [signed the final papers of the I.N.F. treaty.] (Report on INF and START and other negotiations.)

Now, part of the realism and candor we were determined to bring to negotiations with Soviet^{Union} meant refusing to put all the weight of these negotiations and our bilateral relationship on the single difficult issue of arms negotiations. We have understood full well that the agenda of discussion must be broadened to deal with the more fundamental differences between us. This is the meaning of realism. As I never tire of saying, nations do not mistrust each other because they are armed, they are armed because they mistrust each other.

So other items on the agenda dealt with critical issues like regional conflicts, human rights and people-to-people exchanges. with regard to regional conflicts, here too, we can see momentous progress. We are now in the third week of the pull out of Soviet

the political order would come into conflict with the economic order -- only he was wrong in predicting which part of the world this would occur in. For the crisis came not in the capitalist west but in the Communist east. I noted the economic difficulties now reaching the critical stage in the Soviet Union; and I said that at other times in history the ruling elites had faced such situations and, when they encountered resolve and determination from free nations, decided to loosen their grip. It was then I suggested that ^{the} tide of history ^{was} ~~were~~ running in the cause of freedom but only if we as free men and women worked together in a crusade for freedom, a crusade that would be not so much a struggle of armed might, not so much a test of bombs and rockets ^{as} ~~but~~ a test of faith and will.

Well, that crusade for freedom, that crusade for peace is well underway. We have found the will. We have kept the faith. And, whatever happens, whatever triumphs or disappointments *lie* ahead, we must hold fast to our strategy of strength and candor -- our strategy of hope, hope in the eventual triumph of freedom. Let us take further, practical steps. I am hopeful that our own National Endowment for Democracy, which has helped democratic institutions in many lands, will spark parallel organizations in European nations. I praise the Council of Europe which, in conjunction with the European Parliament, has held two international democracy conferences including one on Third World democracy. The latest conference has called for establishment of an International Institute of Democracy; the United States heartily endorses this proposal.

But as we move forward with these steps, let us not fail to

Normandy beaches to commemorate the selflessness that comes from such pride and faith. And, I wonder if you might permit me to recall this morning another such moment, one that took place 18 months after Overload^r and the rescue of Europe.

Operation Market Garden, it was called. A plan to suddenly drop two British and one American airborne armies on Belgium and launch a great flanking movement around the Siegfried line and into the heart of Germany. A battalion of British paratroopers was given the great task of seizing the bridge deep in enemy territory at Arnhem. For a terrible, terrible week, in one of the most valiant exploits in the annals of war, they held out against hopeless odds. A few years ago, a reunion of those magnificent veterans, British, Americans and other of our allies was held in New York City. From the dispatch by New York Times reporter Maurice Carrol there was this paragraph: "'Look at him,' said Henry Knap an American newspaperman who headed the Dutch Underground's intelligence operation in Arnhem. He gestured toward General John Frost, a bluff Briton who had commanded the battalion that held the bridge. 'Look at him...still with that black moustache. If you put him at the end of a bridge even today and said 'keep it,' he'd keep it.'"

The story also told of the wife of Cornelius Ryan, the American writer who immortalized Market Garden in his book, "A Bridge Too Far." She told the reporter that just as Mr. Ryan was finishing his book -- writing the final paragraphs about Colonel Frost's valiant stand at Arnhem and about how in his eyes his men would always be undefeated -- her husband burst into tears. That was quite unlike him; and Mrs. Ryan, alarmed, rushed to him. The

40

WHITE HOUSE STAFFING MEMORANDUM

DATE: 05/16/88 ACTION/CONCURRENCE/COMMENT DUE BY: C.O.B. Friday 05/20/88

SUBJECT: PRESIDENTIAL ADDRESS: FOREIGN AFFAIRS ORGANIZATION
LONDON, ENGLAND
(05/16 4:00 p.m. draft)

	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 checked="" 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"/>	COURTEMANCHE	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
GRISCOM	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

REMARKS:

Please provide any comments/recommendations directly to Tony Dolan by close of business on Friday, May 20th, with an info copy to my office. Thanks.

[Let's try for 25 minutes]

RESPONSE:

Tony: -change on bottom P-1
 -I think you might want to trim a little in front to make quicker into speech - see suggestions
 -I really feel this hits home!!

Rhett Dawson
Ext. 2702

JD

(Dolan)
May 16, 1988
4:00 p.m.

PRESIDENTIAL ADDRESS: FOREIGN AFFAIRS ORGANIZATION
GUILDHALL
LONDON, ENGLAND
FRIDAY, JUNE 3, 1988

Received 5:20
1988 MAY 16 PM 5:20

I wonder if you can imagine what it is for an American to stand in this place. Back in the States, you know, we are terribly proud of anything more than a few hundred years old. Indeed, there are those who see in my election to the Presidency America's attempt to show our European cousins that we too have a regard for antiquity.

Guildhall has been here since the 14th century. And while it is comforting at my age to be near anything that much older than myself, the age of this institution, venerable as it is, is hardly all that impresses. Who after all can come here and not think upon the moments these walls have seen: the many times the people of this city and nation have gathered here in national crisis or national triumph. In the darkest hours of the last world war -- when the tense drama of Edward R. Murrow's opening..."This is London"...was enough to impress on millions of Americans the mettle of the British people -- how many times in those days did proceedings here conclude with a moving, majestic hymn to your country and to the cause of civilization for which you stood. From the Marne to El Alamein to Arnhem to the Falklands, you have in this century so often remained steadfast for what is right -- and against evil. You are a brave people and this land truly, as that hymn heard so often here proclaims, a "land of hope and glory." And it is why Nancy and I -- in the ~~twilight of a Presidency and in the evening of our lives~~ ^{closing days of this historic trip} -- are

glad to be in England once again. After a long journey, we feel among friends; and with all our hearts we thank you for having us here.

Such feelings are, of course, especially appropriate to this occasion; we are here in part to celebrate the special relationship between the United States and Great Britain, a relationship at the center of the NATO alliance.

This hardly means we've always had perfect understanding or unanimity on every issue. When I first visited Mrs. Thatcher at the British Embassy in 1981, she mischievously reminded me that the huge portrait dominating the grand staircase was none other than that of George the III; though she did graciously concede that today most of her countrymen would agree with Jefferson that a little revolution is now and then a good thing. I'm also reminded of a time when Sir Winston, who wasn't always as sedate as he appears over there (points to statue of seated, reflective Churchill), grew so exasperated with American diplomacy he called our Secretary of State at a press conference, quote: "the only case I know of a bull carrying his own china closet with him."

[Then too, during his religious talks in our country, the English Jesuit and author, Reverend Barnard Basset, delights his American audiences by revealing some of the naughty things you used to say about our G.I.'s, when they peacefully invaded your island 44 years ago so that together we could not-so-peacefully invade Nazi-held Europe. "What is the difference," one of your naughty stories went "between a cow chewing his cud and a G.I. chewing gum?" Answer: "The look of intelligence on the cow's face."]

Not that we Americans haven't had our moments. I once dared to remind you of your own youthful and rambunctious days when an English king angrily asked the Duke of Dublin whether it was true that he had just burned down the local cathedral. Yes, replied the Duke, "but only because I thought the archbishop was inside." And then we do hear stories from the French about your famous absorption with all things British, they even claim this headline actually appeared in a British newspaper: "Fog Covers Channel. Continent cut off."

So there has always been, as there should be among friends, an element of fun about our differences. I gained a lesson in this point from an English army officer in 1947 when I was on location here for a film. He explained to me that one day during the war, he was standing in a pub with some of his comrades when a group of American airmen entered nosily, set up a round or two, got a bit rowdy and started making some toasts that were less than complimentary to certain members of the British royalty.

"To heck...to heck with...a prominent member of British royalty," the Yanks shouted. (Obviously I'm not quoting them exactly.) Quite properly offended by this rude behavior but determined to give as good as they got -- the British officer and his comrades responded with a toast of their own: "To heck (and here again the quotation is not exact), "...to heck with the President of the United States." Whereupon all the Americans in the bar grabbed their glasses and yelled: "we'll drink to that."

Well, whatever I learned here about our differences, let me also assure you I learned more about how much we have in common...and the depth of our friendship. And, you know, I have

often mentioned this in the States but I have never had an opportunity to tell a British audience how during that first visit here I was, like most Americans, anxious to see some of those 700-year~~s~~ old inns I had been told abound in this country. Well, a driver took me and a couple of other people to an old inn, a pub really, what we would call a "mom and pop place." This quite elderly lady was waiting on us, and finally, hearing us talk to each other, she said, "You're Americans, aren't you?" We said we were. "Oh," she said, "there were quite a lot of your young chaps down the road during the war, based down there." And she added, "They used to come in here of an evening, and they'd have songfest. And they called me Mom, and they called the old man Pop." Then her mood changed and she said, "It was Christmas Eve. And, you know, we were all alone and feeling a bit down. And, suddenly, in they came, burst through the door, and they had presents for me and Pop." And by this time she wasn't looking at us anymore. She was looking off into the distance and with tears in her eyes remembering that time. And she said, "Big strapping lads they was, from a place called Ioway."

From a place called Ioway; and Oregon, California, Texas, New Jersey, Georgia. Here with other young men from Lancaster, Hampshire, Glasgow and Dorset -- all of them caught up in the terrible paradoxes of that time: that young men must wage war to end war; and die for freedom so that freedom itself might live.

And it is those same two causes for which they fought and died -- the cause of peace, the cause of freedom for all humanity -- that still bring us, British and American, to this place.

It was for these causes of peace and freedom that the people of Great Britain, the United States and other allied nations have for 44 years made enormous sacrifices to keep our military ready and our alliance strong. And for these causes we have in this decade embarked on a new post-war strategy, a strategy of public candor about the moral and fundamental differences between statism and democracy but a strategy also of vigorous diplomatic engagement. A policy that rejects both the inevitability of war or the permanence of totalitarian rule; a policy based on realism that seeks not just treaties for treaties' sake but the recognition of fundamental issues and their eventual resolution.

The pursuit of this policy has just now taken me to Moscow, and let me say: I believe this policy is bearing fruit. Quite possibly, we are breaking out of the post-war era; quite possibly, we are entering a new time in history, one made possible by authentic change in the Soviet Union and its ideology, a change that itself results from the steadfastness of the allied democracies over the past 40 years and especially in this decade.

I saw evidence of this change at the Kremlin. But before I report to you on events in Moscow, I hope you will permit me to say something that has been much on my mind for several years now but most especially over the past few days while I was in the Soviet Union.

The history of our time will undoubtedly include a footnote about how during this decade and the last, the voices of retreat and hopelessness reached crescendo in the West -- insisting the only way to peace was unilateral disarmament; proposing nuclear

freezes, opposing deployment of counterbalancing and deterrent weapons such as intermediate-range missiles or the more recent concept of strategic defense systems.

These same voices ridiculed the notion of going beyond arms control -- the hope of doing something more than merely establishing artificial limits within which the arms races continues almost unabated. Arms reduction would never work, they said, and when the Soviets left the negotiating table in Geneva for 11 months, they proclaimed disaster.

And yet it was NATO's zero-option plan, much maligned when first proposed, that is the basis for the I.N.F. treaty [the final papers of which Mr. Gorbachev and I signed just 24 hours ago;] the first treaty ever that did not just control arms but reduced them and, yes, actually eliminated an entire class of nuclear weapons. Similarly, just as these voices urged retreat or slow withdrawal at every point of Communist expansion, we have seen what a forward strategy for freedom and direct aid to those struggling for self-determination ^{in Afghanistan} can achieve. For ~~2 weeks now,~~ Soviet troops ~~have been departing Afghanistan and there is hope of similar change in other regional conflicts.~~

*This is
ridicled up
2-page
later so
I am
deep
here*

This treaty and the development in Afghanistan are momentous events. Not conclusive. But momentous.

And that is why although history will, as it has about the skeptics and naysayers of any time, duly note that we too heard voices of denial and doubt, it is the voices of hope and strength that will be best remembered. And here I want to say that through all the troubles of the last decade, one such voice, a voice of eloquence and firmness, a voice that proclaimed proudly

the cause of the western alliance and human freedom, has been heard. And even as that voice never sacrificed its anti-Communist credentials or realistic, hard-headed appraisal of change in the Soviet Union, it did, because it came from the senior leader in the alliance, become one of the first to recognize real change when real change was underway, and to suggest that we could, as that voice put it, "do business with Mr. Gorbachev."

So this is my first official duty here today. Prime Minister, the achievements of the Moscow summit as well as the Geneva and Washington summits before them ~~are the work of your~~ ^{Say much about} your valor and strength and by virtue of the office you hold, the work of the British people. So let me say, simply: At this hour in history, Prime Minister, the entire world ~~is in your debt~~ ^{salutes you} and ~~in the debt of~~ your gallant people and gallant nation.

And while your leadership and the vision of the British people have been an inspiration not just to my own people but to all of those who love freedom and yearn for peace, I know you join me in a deep sense of appreciation for the efforts and support of the leaders and peoples of all the allied nations. Whether deploying crucial weapons of deterrence, standing fast in the Persian Gulf, combating terrorism and aggression by outlaw regimes or helping freedom fighters around the globe, rarely in history has any alliance acted with such firmness and dispatch, and on so many fronts. In a process reaching back as far as the founding of NATO and the Common Market, the House of Europe has stood as one; and, joined by the United States and other democracies such as Japan, moved forward with diplomatic

achievement and a startling growth of democracies and free markets all across the globe -- in short, an expansion of the frontiers of freedom and a lessening of the chances of war. I believe history will record our time as the time of the renaissance of the democracies; a time when faced with those twin threats of nuclear terror and totalitarian rule that so darkened this century, the democracies ignored the voices of retreat and despair and found deep within themselves the resources for a renewal of strength and purpose.

So, it is within this context ~~[of gratitude to you, Prime Minister, to the British people and to all our valiant allies]~~ that I report ~~to you~~ now on events in Moscow.

Yesterday, at ___ Greenwich time, Mr. Gorbachev and I [signed the final papers of the I.N.F. treaty.] (Report on INF and START and other negotiations.)

Now, part of the realism and candor we were determined to bring to negotiations with Soviets meant refusing to put all the weight of these negotiations and our bilateral relationship on the single difficult issue of arms negotiations. We have understood full well that the agenda of discussion must be broadened to deal with the more fundamental differences between us. This is the meaning of realism. As I never tire of saying, nations do not mistrust each other because they are armed, they are armed because they mistrust each other.

So other items on the agenda dealt with critical issues like regional conflicts, human rights and people-to-people exchanges with regard to regional conflicts, here too, we can see momentous progress. We are now in the third week of the pull out of Soviet

troops from Afghanistan. The importance of this step cannot be underestimated. (Report on Afghanistan, and other regional conflicts.)

Our third area of discussion was human rights. (Human rights report.)

And finally the matter of bilateral contacts between our peoples. Let me say that this trip itself saw many such contacts. At Moscow State University, at the orthodox monastery at Daniloff, at meetings with Soviet dissidents, artists, and writers, I saw and heard... (Report on meeting and bilateral agreements.)

← Pick up
greater
exchange w/
high
school
students

All of this I took as further evidence that it is usually governments not people who make war on each other. And I am reminded of the words of Gandhi, spoken shortly after he visited Britain in his quest for independence that he was "not conscious of a single experience throughout my 3 months in England and Europe that made me feel that after all East is East and West is West. On the contrary, I have been convinced more than ever that human nature is much the same, no matter under what clime it flourishes, and that if you approached people with trust and affection, you would have ten-fold trust and thousand-fold affection returned to you."

And yet while the Moscow summit showed great promise and the response of the Russian people was heartening; let me interject here a note of caution and, I hope, prudence. It has never been disputes between the free peoples and the peoples of the Soviet Union that have been at the heart of post-war tensions and conflicts. No, disputes among governments and the pursuit of a

statist and expansionist ideology has been the central point in our difficulties.

Now that the allies are strong and the power of that ideology is receding both around the world and in the Soviet Union, there is hope. And we look to this trend to continue. We must do all that we can to assist it. And this means openly acknowledging positive change. And crediting it.

But let us also remember the strategy we have adopted is one that provides for setbacks along the way as well as progress, indeed, just as our strategy anticipated positive change, it provides for the opposite as well. So, let us never engage in self-delusion; let us remember that the jury is not yet in; let us be ever vigilant. And while we embrace honest change when it occurs; let us also be wary.

But let us be confident too. Prime Minister, perhaps you remember that upon accepting your gracious invitation to address the members of the Parliament in 1982, I suggested then that the world could well be at a turning point when the two great threats to life in this century -- nuclear war and totalitarian rule -- might now be overcome. I attempted then to give an accounting of the western alliance and what might lie ahead -- including my own view of the prospects for peace and freedom. I suggested that the hard evidence of the totalitarian experiment was now in and that this evidence had led to an uprising of the intellect and will, one that reaffirmed the dignity of the individual in the face of the modern state and could well lead to a worldwide movement towards democracy.

I suggested, too, that in a way Marx was right when he said

the political order would come into conflict with the economic order -- only he was wrong in predicting which part of the world this would occur in. For the crisis came not in the capitalist west but in the Communist east. I noted the economic difficulties now reaching the critical stage in the Soviet Union; and I said that at other times in history the ruling elites had faced such situations and, when they encountered resolve and determination from free nations, decided to loosen their grip. It was then I suggested that tide of history were running in the cause of freedom but only if we as free men and women worked together in a crusade for freedom, a crusade that would be not so much a struggle of armed might, not so much a test of bombs and rockets but a test of faith and will.

Well, that crusade for freedom, that crusade for peace is well underway. We have found the will. We have kept the faith. And, whatever happens, whatever triumphs or disappointments ahead, we must hold fast to our strategy of strength and candor -- our strategy of hope, hope in the eventual triumph of freedom. Let us take further, practical steps. I am hopeful that our own National Endowment for Democracy, which has helped democratic institutions in many lands, will spark parallel organizations in European nations. I praise the Council of Europe which, in conjunction with the European Parliament, has held two international democracy conferences including one on Third World democracy. The latest conference has called for establishment of an International Institute of Democracy; the United States heartily endorses this proposal.

But as we move forward with these steps, let us not fail to

note the lessons we have learned along the way in developing our over-all strategy. We have learned the first objective of the adversaries of freedom is to make free nations question their own faith in freedom, to make us think that adhering to our principals and speaking out against foreign aggression or human rights abuses is somehow an act of belligerence. Over the long run such inhibitions make free peoples taciturn, then silent and ultimately confused about their first principles and half-hearted about their cause. This is the first and most important defeat a free people can ever suffer. For truly, when free peoples cease telling the truth about and to their adversaries, they cease telling the truth to themselves.

It is in this sense that the best indicator of how much we care about freedom is what we say about freedom; it is in this sense, that words truly are actions. And there is one added and quite extraordinary benefit to this sort of realism and public candor: this is also the best way to avoid war or conflict. Too often in the past the adversaries of freedom forgot the reserves of strength and resolve among free nations, too often they interpreted conciliatory words as weakness, too often they miscalculated by underestimating willingness of free men and women to resist to the end. Words for freedom remind them otherwise.

This is the lesson we have learned, the lesson of the last war and, yes, the lesson of Munich. But it is also the lesson taught us by Sir Winston, by London in the Blitz, by the enduring pride and faith of the British people.

Just a few years ago, Prime Minister, you and I stood at the

Normandy beaches to commemorate the selflessness that comes from such pride and faith. And, I wonder if you might permit me to recall this morning another such moment, one that took place 18 months after Overload and the rescue of Europe.

Operation Market Garden, it was called. A plan to suddenly drop two British and one American airborne armies on Belgium and launch a great flanking movement around the Siegfried line and into the heart of Germany. A battalion of British paratroopers was given the great task of seizing the bridge deep in enemy territory at Arnhem. For a terrible, terrible week, in one of the most valiant exploits in the annals of war, they held out against hopeless odds. A few years ago, a reunion of those magnificent veterans, British, Americans and other of our allies was held in New York City. From the dispatch by New York Times reporter Maurice Carrol there was this paragraph: "'Look at him,' said Henry Knap an American newspaperman who headed the Dutch Underground's intelligence operation in Arnhem. He gestured toward General John Frost, a bluff Briton who had commanded the battalion that held the bridge. 'Look at him...still with that black moustache. If you put him at the end of a bridge even today and said 'keep it,' he'd keep it.'"

The story also told of the wife of Cornelius Ryan, the American writer who immortalized Market Garden in his book, "A Bridge Too Far." She told the reporter that just as Mr. Ryan was finishing his book -- writing the final paragraphs about Colonel Frost's valiant stand at Arnhem and about how in his eyes his men would always be undefeated -- her husband burst into tears. That was quite unlike him; and Mrs. Ryan, alarmed, rushed to him. The

writer could only look up and say of Colonel Frost:

"Honestly, what that man went through...."

Seated there in Spaso House with Soviet dissidents a few days ago, I felt the same way and asked myself: what won't men suffer for freedom?

The dispatch concluded with this quote from Colonel Frost about his visits to that bridge at Arnhem. "'We've been going back ever since. Every year we have a -- what's the word -- reunion. No, there's a word.' He turned to his wife, 'Dear what's the word for going to Arnhem?' 'Reunion,' she said. 'No,' he said, 'there's a special word.' She pondered, 'Pilgrimage,' she said. 'Yes, pilgrimage,'" Colonel Frost said.

As those veterans of Arnhem view their time, so we must view ours; we also are on a pilgrimage, a pilgrimage towards those things we honor and love: human dignity, the hope of peace and freedom for all peoples and for all nations. And I have always cherished the belief that all of history is such a pilgrimage and that our maker, while never denying us free will nor altering its immediate effects, over time guides us with a wise and provident hand, giving direction to history and slowly bringing good from evil -- leading us ever so slowly but ever so relentlessly and lovingly to a time when the will of man and God are as one again.

I also cherish the belief that what we have done together in Moscow and throughout this decade has helped bring mankind along the road of that pilgrimage. If this be so, it is due to prayerful recognition of what we are about as a civilization and a people. I mean, of course, the great steps forward, the great civilized ideas that comprise so much of your greatness: the

development of law embodied by your constitutional tradition, the idea of restraint on centralized power and the notion of human rights as established in your Magna Carta, the idea of representative government as embodied by your mother of all parliaments.

But we go beyond even this. It was your own Evelyn Waugh who reminded us that "civilization -- and by this I do not mean talking cinemas and tinned food nor even surgery and hygienic houses but the whole moral and artistic organization of Europe -- has not in itself the power of survival." It came into being, he said, through the Judeo-Christian tradition and "without it has no significance or power to command allegiance. It is no longer possible," he wrote, "to accept the benefits of civilization and at the same time deny the supernatural basis on which it rests."

So, it is first things we must consider. And here it is a story, one last story, can remind us best of what we are about.

You know, we Americans like to think of ourselves as competitive and we do dislike losing; but I must say that judging from the popularity of this story in the United States it must mean that if we do lose, we prefer to do it to you. In any case, it is a story that a few years ago came in the guise of that new art form of the modern world and for which I have an understandable affection -- the cinema, film, the movies.

It is a story about the 1920 Olympics and two British athletes. It is the story of British athlete Harold Abrahams, a young Jew, whose victory -- as his immigrant Italian coach put it -- was a triumph for all those who have come from distant lands and found freedom and refuge here in England.

It was the triumph too of Eric Liddell, a young Scotsman, who would not sacrifice religious conviction for fame. In one unforgettable scene, Eric Liddell reads the words of Isaiah. They speak to us now.

"He giveth power to the faint, and to them that have no might, he increased their strength...but they that wait upon the Lord shall renew their strength...they shall mount up with wings as eagles. They shall run and not be weary...."

Here then is our formula, our ultra secret for the years ahead, for completing our crusade for freedom. Here is the strength of our civilization and the source of our belief in the rights of humanity. Our faith is in a higher law, a greater destiny. We believe in -- indeed, we see today evidence of -- the power of prayer to change all things. And like the founding fathers of both our lands, we posit human rights; we hold that humanity was meant not to be dishonored by the all-powerful state but to live in the image and likeness of him who made us.

My friends, more than three decades ago, an American President told his generation they had a rendezvous with destiny; at almost the same moment a Prime Minister asked the British people for their finest hour. Today, in the face of the twin threats of war and totalitarianism, this rendezvous, this finest hour is still upon us. Let us go forward then -- as on chariots of fire -- and seek to do His will in all things; to stand for freedom; to speak for humanity.

"Come, my friends," as it was said of old by Tennyson, "and let us make a newer world."

(Dolan)
May 16, 1988
4:00 p.m. SS

PRESIDENTIAL ADDRESS: FOREIGN AFFAIRS ORGANIZATION
GUILDHALL
LONDON, ENGLAND
FRIDAY, JUNE 3, 1988

I wonder if you can imagine what it is for an American to stand in this place. Back in the States, you know, we are terribly proud of anything more than a few hundred years old. Indeed, there are those who see in my election to the Presidency America's attempt to show our European cousins that we too have a regard for antiquity.

stet
(~~Guildhall has been~~) *the center of the gov't activity for more than a thousand years* here since the 14th century. And while it is comforting at my age to be near anything that much older than myself, the age of this institution, venerable as it is, is hardly all that impresses. Who after all can come here and not think upon the moments these walls have seen: the many times the people of this city and nation have gathered here in national crisis or national triumph. In the darkest hours of the last world war -- when the tense drama of Edward R. Murrow's opening... "This is London"... was enough to impress on millions of Americans the mettle of the British people -- how many times in those days did proceedings here conclude with a moving, majestic hymn to your country and to the cause of civilization for which you stood. From the Marne to El Alamein to Arnhem to the Falklands, you have in this century so often remained steadfast for what is right -- and against evil. You are a brave people and this land truly, as that hymn heard so often here proclaims, a "land of hope and glory." And it is why Nancy and I -- in the twilight of a Presidency and in the evening of our lives -- are

glad to be in England once again. After a long journey, we feel among friends; and with all our hearts we thank you for having us here.

Such feelings are, of course, especially appropriate to this occasion; we are here in part to celebrate the special relationship between the United States and Great Britain, a relationship at the center of the NATO alliance.

This hardly means we've always had perfect understanding or unanimity on every issue. When I first visited Mrs. Thatcher at the British Embassy in 1981, she mischievously reminded me that the huge portrait dominating the grand staircase was none other than that of George the III; though she did graciously concede that today most of her countrymen would agree with Jefferson that a little ^{rebellion} ~~revolution~~ ^{is} now and then ^{is} a good thing. I'm also reminded of a time when Sir Winston, who wasn't always as sedate as he appears over there (points to statue of seated, reflective Churchill), grew so exasperated with American diplomacy he called our Secretary of State ~~at a press conference~~, quote: "the only case I know of a bull, ^{who carries} ~~carrying~~ his own china ^{shop} ~~closet~~ with him." ✓ ✓

Then too, during his religious talks in our country, the English Jesuit and author, Reverend Barnard Basset, delights his American audiences by revealing some of the naughty things you used to say about our G.I.'s, when they peacefully invaded your island 44 years ago so that together we could not-so-peacefully invade Nazi-held Europe. "What is the difference," one of your naughty stories went "between a cow chewing his cud and a G.I. chewing gum?" Answer: "The look of intelligence on the cow's face."

Not that we Americans haven't had our moments. I once dared to remind you of your own youthful and rambunctious days when an English king angrily asked the Duke of Dublin whether it was true that he had just burned down the local cathedral. Yes, replied the Duke, "but only because I thought the archbishop was inside." And then we do hear stories from the French about your famous absorption with all things British, they even claim this headline actually appeared in a British newspaper: "Fog Covers Channel. Continent cut off."

So there has always been, as there should be among friends, an element of fun about our differences. I gained a lesson in this point from an English army officer in 1947 when I was on location here for a film. He explained to me that one day during the war, he was standing in a pub with some of his comrades when a group of American airmen entered nosily, set up a round or two, got a bit rowdy and started making some toasts that were less than complimentary to certain members of the British royalty.

"To heck...to heck with...a prominent member of British royalty," the Yanks shouted. (Obviously I'm not quoting them exactly.) Quite properly offended by this rude behavior but determined to give as good as they got -- the British officer and his comrades responded with a toast of their own: "To heck (and here again the quotation is not exact), "...to heck with the President of the United States." Whereupon all the Americans in the bar grabbed their glasses and yelled: "we'll drink to that."

Well, whatever I learned here about our differences, let me also assure you I learned more about how much we have in common...and the depth of our friendship. And, you know, I have

often mentioned this in the States but I have never had an opportunity to tell a British audience how during that first visit here I was, like most Americans, anxious to see some of those ⁴700 years old inns I had been told abound in this country. Well, a driver took me and a couple of other people to an old inn, a pub really, what we would call a "mom and pop place." This quite elderly lady was waiting on us, and finally, hearing us talk to each other, she said, "You're Americans, aren't you?" We said we were. "Oh," she said, "there were quite a lot of your young chaps down the road during the war, based down there." And she added, "They used to come in here of an evening, and they'd have songfest. And they called me Mom, and they called the old man Pop." Then her mood changed and she said, "It was Christmas Eve. And, you know, we were all alone and feeling a bit down. And, suddenly, in they came, burst through the door, and they had presents for me and Pop." And by this time she wasn't looking at us anymore. She was looking off into the distance and with tears in her eyes remembering that time. And she said, "Big strapping lads they was, from a place called Ioway."

From a place called Ioway; and Oregon, California, Texas, New Jersey, Georgia. Here with other young men from Lancaster, Hampshire, Glasgow and Dorset -- all of them caught up in the terrible paradoxes of that time: that young men must wage war to end war; and die for freedom so that freedom itself might live.

And it is those same two causes for which they fought and died -- the cause of peace, the cause of freedom for all humanity -- that still bring us, British and American, to this place.

It was for these causes of peace and freedom that the people of Great Britain, the United States and other allied nations have for 44 years made enormous sacrifices to keep our military ready and our alliance strong. And for these causes we have in this decade embarked on a new post-war strategy, a strategy of public candor about the moral and fundamental differences between statism and democracy but a strategy also of vigorous diplomatic engagement. A policy that rejects both the inevitability of war or the permanence of totalitarian rule; a policy based on realism that seeks not just treaties for treaties' sake but the recognition of fundamental issues and their eventual resolution.

The pursuit of this policy has just now taken me to Moscow and let me say: I believe this policy is bearing fruit. Quite possibly, we are breaking out of the post-war era; quite possibly, we are entering a new time in history, one made possible by authentic change in the Soviet Union and its ideology, a change that itself results from the steadfastness of the allied democracies over the past 40 years and especially in this decade.

I saw evidence of this change at the Kremlin. But before I report to you on events in Moscow, I hope you will permit me to say something that has been much on my mind for several years now but most especially over the past few days while I was in the Soviet Union.

The history of our time will undoubtedly include a footnote about how during this decade and the last, the voices of retreat and hopelessness reached crescendo in the West -- insisting the only way to peace was unilateral disarmament; proposing nuclear

freezes, opposing deployment of counterbalancing and deterrent weapons such as intermediate-range missiles or the more recent concept of strategic defense systems.

These same voices ridiculed the notion of going beyond arms control -- the hope of doing something more than merely establishing artificial limits within which the arms races continues almost unabated. Arms reduction would never work, they said, and when the Soviets left the negotiating table in Geneva for 1¹/₂ months, they proclaimed disaster.

And yet it was ~~NATO's~~^{my} zero-option plan, much maligned when first proposed, that is the basis for the I.N.F. treaty [the *instruments of ratification* ~~final papers~~ of which Mr. Gorbachev and I ~~signed~~^{exchanged} just [?] (24 hours) ago;] the first treaty ever that did not just control arms but reduced them and, yes, actually eliminated an entire class of nuclear weapons. Similarly, just as these voices urged retreat or slow withdrawal at every point of Communist expansion, we have seen what a forward strategy for freedom and direct aid to those struggling for self-determination can achieve. For ³ 2 weeks now, Soviet troops have been departing Afghanistan and there is hope of similar change in other regional conflicts.

This treaty and the development in Afghanistan are momentous events. Not conclusive. But momentous.

And that is why although history will, as it has about the skeptics and naysayers of any time, duly note that we too heard voices of denial and doubt, it is the voices of hope and strength that will be best remembered. And here I want to say that through all the troubles of the last decade, one such voice, a voice of eloquence and firmness, a voice that proclaimed proudly

the cause of the western alliance and human freedom, has been heard. And even as that voice never sacrificed its anti-Communist credentials or realistic, hard-headed appraisal of change in the Soviet Union, it did, because it came from the *longest serving* senior leader in the alliance, become one of the first to recognize real change when real change was underway, and to suggest that we could, as that voice put it, "do business ~~with~~ *start* Mr. Gorbachev."

So this is my first official duty here today. Prime Minister, the achievements of the Moscow summit as well as the Geneva and Washington summits before them are the work of your valor and strength and by virtue of the office you hold, the work of the British people. So let me say, simply: At this hour in history, Prime Minister, the entire world is in your debt and in the debt of your gallant people and gallant nation.

And while your leadership and the vision of the British people have been an inspiration not just to my own people but to all of those who love freedom and yearn for peace, I know you join me in a deep sense of appreciation for the efforts and support of the leaders and peoples of all the allied nations. Whether deploying crucial weapons of deterrence, standing fast in the Persian Gulf, combating terrorism and aggression by outlaw regimes or helping freedom fighters around the globe, rarely in history has any *Group of free nations* ~~alliance~~ acted with such firmness and dispatch, ✓ and on so many fronts. In a process reaching back as far as the founding of NATO and the Common Market, the House of Europe has stood as one; and, joined by the United States and other democracies such as Japan, moved forward with diplomatic

achievement and a startling growth of democracies and free markets all across the globe -- in short, an expansion of the frontiers of freedom and a lessening of the chances of war. I believe history will record our time as the time of the renaissance of the democracies; a time when faced with those twin threats of nuclear terror and totalitarian rule that so darkened this century, the democracies ignored the voices of retreat and despair and found deep within themselves the resources for a renewal of strength and purpose.

So, it is within this context of gratitude to you, Prime Minister, to the British people and to all our valiant allies that I report to you now on events in Moscow.

Yesterday, at ___ Greenwich time, Mr. Gorbachev and I *exchanged instruments of ratification* [signed the ~~final papers~~ of the I.N.F. treaty.] (Report on INF and START and other negotiations.) ✓

Now, part of the realism and candor we were determined to bring to negotiations with Soviets meant refusing to put all the weight of these negotiations and our bilateral relationship on the single difficult issue of arms negotiations. We have understood full well that the agenda of discussion must be broadened to deal with the more fundamental differences between us. This is the meaning of realism. As I never tire of saying, nations do not mistrust each other because they are armed, they are armed because they mistrust each other.

So other items on the agenda dealt with critical issues like regional conflicts, human rights and *bilateral* ~~people-to-people~~ exchanges with regard to regional conflicts, here too, we can see momentous progress. We are now in the third week of the pull out of Soviet X

troops from Afghanistan. The importance of this step cannot be underestimated. (Report on Afghanistan, and other regional conflicts.)

Our third area of discussion was human rights. (Human rights report.)

And finally the matter of bilateral contacts between our peoples. Let me say that this trip itself saw many such contacts. At Moscow State University, at the orthodox monastery at Daniloff, at meetings with Soviet dissidents, artists, and writers, I saw and heard... (Report on meeting and bilateral agreements.)

All of this I took as further evidence that it is usually governments not people who make war on each other. And I am reminded of the words of Gandhi, spoken shortly after he visited Britain in his quest for independence that he was "not conscious of a single experience throughout ^[his] 3 months in England and Europe that made ^[him] me feel that after all East is East and West is West. " On the contrary, ^{he said} "I have been convinced more than ever that human nature is much the same, no matter under what clime it flourishes, and that if you approached people with trust and affection, you would have ten-fold trust and thousand-fold affection returned to you."

And yet while the Moscow summit showed great promise and the response of the ^{Soviet} ~~Russian~~ people was heartening; let me interject here a note of caution and, I hope, prudence. It has never been disputes between the free peoples and the peoples of the Soviet Union that have been at the heart of post-war tensions and conflicts. No, disputes among governments and the pursuit of a

statist and expansionist ideology has been the central point in our difficulties.

Now that the allies are strong and the power of that ideology is receding both around the world and in the Soviet Union, there is hope. And we look to this trend to continue. We must do all that we can to assist it. And this means openly acknowledging positive change. And crediting it.

But let us also remember the strategy we have adopted is one that provides for setbacks along the way as well as progress, indeed, just as our strategy anticipated positive change, it provides for the opposite as well. So, let us never engage in self-delusion; let us remember that the jury is not yet in; let us be ever vigilant. And while we embrace honest change when it occurs; let us also be wary.

Van Clavin
X 3723

But let us be confident too. Prime Minister, perhaps you remember that upon accepting ^{her Majesty's} ~~your~~ gracious invitation to address the members of the Parliament in 1982, I suggested then that the world could well be at a turning point when the two great threats to life in this century -- nuclear war and totalitarian rule -- might now be overcome. I attempted then to give an accounting of the western alliance and what might lie ahead -- including my own view of the prospects for peace and freedom. I suggested that the hard evidence of the totalitarian experiment was now in and that this evidence had led to an uprising of the intellect and will, one that reaffirmed the dignity of the individual in the face of the modern state and could well lead to a worldwide movement towards democracy.

I suggested, too, that in a way Marx was right when he said

the political order would come into conflict with the economic order -- only he was wrong in predicting which part of the world this would occur in. For the crisis came not in the capitalist west but in the Communist east. I noted the economic difficulties now reaching the critical stage in the Soviet Union; and I said that at other times in history the ruling elites had faced such situations and, when they encountered resolve and determination from free nations, decided to loosen their grip. It was then I suggested that tide of history were running in the cause of freedom but only if we as free men and women worked together in a crusade for freedom, a crusade that would be not so much a struggle of armed might, not so much a test of bombs and rockets but a test of faith and will.

Well, that crusade for freedom, that crusade for peace is well underway. We have found the will. We have kept the faith. And, whatever happens, whatever triumphs or disappointments ahead, we must hold fast to our strategy of strength and candor -- our strategy of hope, hope in the eventual triumph of freedom. Let us take further, practical steps. I am hopeful that our own National Endowment for Democracy, which has helped democratic institutions in many lands, will spark parallel organizations in European nations. I praise the Council of Europe which, in conjunction with the European Parliament, has held two international democracy conferences including one on Third World democracy. The latest conference has called for establishment of an International Institute of Democracy; the United States heartily endorses this proposal.

But as we move forward with these steps, let us not fail to

note the lessons we have learned along the way in developing our over-all strategy. We have learned the first objective of the adversaries of freedom is to make free nations question their own faith in freedom, to make us think that adhering to our principals and speaking out against foreign aggression or human rights abuses is somehow an act of belligerence. Over the long run such inhibitions make free peoples taciturn, then silent and ultimately confused about their first principles and half-hearted about their cause. This is the first and most important defeat a free people can ever suffer. For truly, when free peoples cease telling the truth about and to their adversaries, they cease telling the truth to themselves.

It is in this sense that the best indicator of how much we care about freedom is what we say about freedom; it is in this sense, that words truly are actions. And there is one added and quite extraordinary benefit to this sort of realism and public candor: this is also the best way to avoid war or conflict. Too often in the past the adversaries of freedom forgot the reserves of strength and resolve among free nations, too often they interpreted conciliatory words as weakness, too often they miscalculated by underestimating willingness of free men and women to resist to the end. Words for freedom remind them otherwise.

This is the lesson we have learned, the lesson of the last war and, yes, the lesson of Munich. But it is also the lesson taught us by Sir Winston, by London in the Blitz, by the enduring pride and faith of the British people.

Just a few years ago, *her Majesty, Queen Elizabeth*
~~Prime Minister,~~ you and I stood at the

Normandy beaches to commemorate the selflessness that comes from such pride and faith. And, I wonder if you might permit me to recall this morning another such moment, one that took place ³ 18 months after ^{"Overlord"} Overload and the rescue of Europe.

["]Operation Market Garden["], it was called. A plan to suddenly drop ^{one} ~~two~~ British and ^{two} ~~one~~ American airborne ^{divisions the Netherlands} ~~armies~~ on Belgium and launch a great ^{attack on the flanks of} ~~flanking~~ movement around the Siegfried line and into the heart of Germany. A battalion of British paratroopers was given the great task of seizing the bridge deep in enemy territory at Arnhem. For a terrible, terrible ^{10 days} ~~week~~, in one of the most valiant exploits in the annals of war, they held out against hopeless odds. A few years ago, a reunion of those magnificent veterans, British, Americans and other of our allies was held in New York City. From the dispatch by New York Times reporter Maurice Carrol there was this paragraph: "'Look at him,' said Henry Knap an ^{Amsterdam} ~~American~~ newspaperman who headed the Dutch Underground's intelligence operation in Arnhem. He gestured toward General John Frost, a bluff Briton who had commanded the battalion that held the bridge. 'Look at him...still with that black moustache. If you put him at the end of a bridge even today and said 'keep it,' he'd keep it.'"

The story also told of the wife of Cornelius Ryan, the American writer who immortalized Market Garden in his book, "A Bridge Too Far." She told the reporter that just as Mr. Ryan was finishing his book -- writing the final paragraphs about Colonel Frost's valiant stand at Arnhem and about how in his eyes his men would always be undefeated -- her husband burst into tears. That was (quite unlike him; and Mrs. Ryan, alarmed, rushed to him.) The

writer could only look up and say of Colonel Frost:

"Honestly, what that man went through...."

Seated there in Spaso House with Soviet dissidents a few days ago, I felt the same way and asked myself: what won't men suffer for freedom?

The dispatch concluded with this quote from ~~Colonel Frost~~ ^{Colonel Stet} about his visits to that bridge at Arnhem. "'We've been going back ever since. Every year we have a -- what's the word -- reunion. No, there's a word.' He turned to his wife, 'Dear what's the word for going to Arnhem?' 'Reunion,' she said. 'No,' he said, 'there's a special word.' She pondered, ~~Cornelius Ryan~~ ^{Stet} 'Pilgrimage,' she said. 'Yes, pilgrimage,'" ~~Colonel Frost~~ said.

As those veterans of Arnhem view their time, so we must view ours; we also are on a pilgrimage, a pilgrimage towards those things we honor and love: human dignity, the hope of peace and freedom for all peoples and for all nations. And I have always cherished the belief that all of history is such a pilgrimage and that our maker, while never denying us free will nor altering its immediate effects, over time guides us with a wise and provident hand, giving direction to history and slowly bringing good from evil -- leading us ever so slowly but ever so relentlessly and lovingly to a time when the will of man and God are as one again.

I also cherish the belief that what we have done together in Moscow and throughout this decade has helped bring mankind along the road of that pilgrimage. If this be so, it is due to prayerful recognition of what we are about as a civilization and a people. I mean, of course, the great steps forward, the great civilized ideas that comprise so much of your greatness: the

development of law embodied by your constitutional tradition, the idea of restraint on centralized power and the notion of human rights as established in your Magna Carta, the idea of representative government as embodied by your mother of all parliaments.

But we go beyond even this. It was your own Evelyn Waugh who reminded us that "civilization -- and by this I do not mean talking cinemas and tinned food nor even surgery and hygienic houses but the whole moral and artistic organization of Europe -- has not in itself the power of survival." It came into being, he said, through the ^{A.C.} (Judeo-Christian) tradition and "without it has no significance or power to command allegiance. It is no longer possible," he wrote, "to accept the benefits of civilization and at the same time deny the supernatural basis on which it rests,"

So, it is first things we must consider. And here it is a story, one last story, can remind us best of what we are about.

You know, we Americans like to think of ourselves as competitive and we do dislike losing; but I must say that judging from the popularity of this story in the United States it must mean that if we do lose, we prefer to do it to you. In any case, it is a story that a few years ago came in the guise of that new art form of the modern world and for which I have an understandable affection -- the cinema, film, the movies.

It is a story about the 1920 Olympics and two British athletes. It is the story of British athlete Harold Abrahams, a young Jew, whose victory -- as his immigrant ^{Arab} Italian coach put it -- was a triumph for all those who have come from distant lands and found freedom and refuge here in England.

It was the triumph too of Eric Liddell, a young Scotsman, who would not sacrifice religious conviction for fame. In one unforgettable scene, Eric Liddell reads the words of Isaiah. They speak to us now.

"He giveth power to the faint, and to them that have no might, he increased their strength...but they that wait upon the Lord shall renew their strength...they shall mount up with wings as eagles. They shall run and not be weary...."

Here then is our formula, our ultra secret for the years ahead, for completing our crusade for freedom. Here is the strength of our civilization and the source of our belief in the rights of humanity. Our faith is in a higher law, a greater destiny. We believe in -- indeed, we see today evidence of -- the power of prayer to change all things. And like the founding fathers of both our lands, we posit human rights; we hold that humanity was meant not to be dishonored by the all-powerful state but to live in the image and likeness of him who made us.

My friends, more than ^{five}~~three~~ decades ago, an American President told his generation they had a rendezvous with destiny; at almost the same moment a Prime Minister asked the British people for their finest hour. Today, in the face of the twin threats of war and totalitarianism, this rendezvous, this finest hour is still upon us. Let us go forward then -- as on chariots of fire -- and seek to do His will in all things; to stand for freedom; to speak for humanity.

"Come, my friends," as it was said of old by Tennyson, ^{'tis not too late to seek}
~~"and let us make a newer world."~~

(Judge)
May 24, 1988
3:00 p.m.

Barbara
RR

PRESIDENTIAL ADDRESS: ADDRESS ON EAST-WEST RELATIONS
FINLANDIA HALL
HELSINKI, FINLAND
FRIDAY MAY 27, 1988

Mr. President, Mr. Speaker, Mr. Prime Minister, Ladies and
Gentlemen:

Let me begin by saying thank you to our hosts, the Finnish
Government, the Paaskivi [PAH-skah-vee] Society, and the League
of Finnish-American Societies.

It is a particular honor for me to come here today. This
year -- the "Year of Friendship," as Congress has proclaimed it,
between the United States and Finland -- this year marks the
350th anniversary of the arrival of the first Finns in America
and the establishment of a small Scandinavian colony near what is
today Wilmington, Delaware. An ancient people in a new world --
that is the story, not only of those Finns, but of all the
peoples who braved the seas, to settle in and build my country, a
land of freedom for a nation of immigrants.

Yes, they founded a new world, but as they crossed the
oceans, the mountains, and the prairies, those who made America
carried the old world in their hearts -- the old customs, the
family ties, and, most of all, the belief in God, a belief that
gave them the moral compass and ethical foundation by which they
explored an uncharted frontier and constructed a government and
nation of, by, and for the people.

And so, although we Americans became a new people, we also
remain an ancient one, for we are guided by ancient and universal

values -- values that Prime Minister Holkeri [HOL-care-ee] spoke of in Los Angeles this February when, after recalling Finland's internationally recognized position of neutrality, he added that Finland is "tied to Western values of freedom, democracy, and human rights."

And let me add here that for America, those ties are also the bonds of our friendship. America respects Finland's neutrality. We support Finland's independence. We honor Finland's courageous history. We salute the creative statesmanship that has been Finland's gift to world peace. And in this soaring hall -- which is the great architect Alvar Aalto's statement of hope for Finland's future -- we reaffirm our hope and faith that the friendship between our nations will be unending.

We are gathered here today in this hall because it was here, almost 13 years ago, that the 35 nations of the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe signed the Helsinki Final Act -- a document that embodies the same ethical and moral principles and the same hope for a future of peace that Finns and so many other European immigrants gave America. The Final Act is a singular statement of hope. Its "three baskets" touch on almost every aspect of East-West relations, and taken together form a kind of map through the wilderness of mutual hostility to open fields of peace and to a common home of trust among all of our sovereign nations -- neutrals, non-aligned, and alliance members alike. The Final Act set new standards of conduct for

our nations and provided the mechanisms by which to apply those standards.

Yes, the Final Act goes beyond arms control -- once the focus of international dialogue. It reflects a truth that I have so often noted -- nations do not distrust each other because they are armed; they are armed because they distrust each other. The Final Act grapples with the full range of our underlying differences and deals with East-West relations as an interrelated whole. It reflects the belief of all our countries that human rights are less likely to be abused when a nation's security is less in doubt; that economic relations can contribute to security, but depend on the trust and confidence that come from increasing ties between our peoples, increasing openness, and increasing freedom; and that there is no true international security without respect for human rights.

And beyond establishing these integrated standards, the Final Act establishes a process for progress. It sets up a review procedure to measure performance against standards. And -- despite the doubts of the critics -- for the past 13 years, the signatory states have mustered the political will to keep on working and making progress.

Let me say that it seems particularly appropriate to me that the Final Act is associated so closely with this city and this country. More than any other diplomatic document, the Final Act speaks to the yearning that Finland's longtime President, Urho [ER-ho] Kekkonen [KECK-oh-nen], spoke of more than a quarter century ago, when he said, in his words, "It is the fervent hope

of the Finnish people that barriers be lowered all over Europe and that progress be made along the road of European unity." And he added that this was, as he put it, "for the good of Europe, and thus of humanity as a whole." Those were visionary words. That vision inspired and shaped the drafting of the Final Act and continues to guide us today.

Has the Final Act and what we call the Helsinki process worked or not? Many say it hasn't, but I believe it has.

In the security field, I would point to the most recent fruit of the process -- the Stockholm Document on confidence- and security-building measures in Europe. This agreement lays down the rules by which our 35 states notify each other of upcoming military activities in Europe; provides detailed information on these activities in advance; lets the others know their plans for very large military activities one to two years in advance and agrees not to hold such maneuvers unless this notice is given; invites observers to their larger military activities; and permits on-site inspections to make sure the agreement is honored.

I am happy to note that since our representatives shook hands to seal this agreement a year and a half ago, all 35 states have, by and large, honored both the letter and the spirit of the Stockholm Document. The Western and neutral and non-aligned states have set a strong example in providing full information about their military activities. In April, Finland held its first military activity subject to the Stockholm notification requirements and voluntarily invited observers to it. The Soviet

Union and its allies also have a generally good record of implementation, though less forthcoming than the West. Ten on-site inspections have been conducted so far, and more and more states are exercising their right to make such inspections. I can't help but believe that making inspections a matter of routine business will improve openness and enhance confidence.

Nor was Stockholm the end of the process. In Vienna, all 35 signatory states are considering how to strengthen the confidence- and security-building measures, in the context of a balanced outcome at the C.S.C.E. follow-up meeting that includes significant progress on human rights.

In the economic field, as in the security field, I believe there has been progress, but of a different kind. Issues and negotiations regarding security are not simple, but military technology makes arms and armies resemble each other enough so that common measures can be confidently applied. Economic relations, by contrast, are bedeviled by differences in our systems. Perhaps increases in non-strategic trade can contribute to better relations between East and West, but it is difficult to relate the state-run economies of the East to the essentially free-market economies of the West. Perhaps some of the changes underway in the state-run economies will equip them better to deal with our businessmen, and open new arenas for cooperation. But our work on these issues over the years has already made us understand that differences in systems are serious obstacles to expansion of economic ties, and since understanding of unpleasant realities is part of wisdom, that too, is progress.

The changes taking place in the Eastern countries of the continent go beyond changes in their economic systems and greater openness in their military activities: changes have also begun to occur in the field of human rights, as was called for in the Final Act. The rest of us would like to see the changes that are being announced actually registered in the law and practice of our Eastern partners, and in the documents under negotiation in the Vienna follow-up to the Helsinki Conference.

Much has been said about the human rights and humanitarian provisions in the Final Act and the failure of the Eastern bloc to honor them. Yet, for all the bleak winds that have swept the plains of justice since that signing day in 1975, the Accords have taken root in the conscience of humanity and grown in moral and, increasingly, in diplomatic authority. I believe that this is no accident. It reflects an increasing realization that the agenda of East-West relations must be comprehensive -- that security and human rights must be advanced together, or cannot truly be secured at all. But it also shows that the provisions in the Final Act reflect standards that are truly universal in their scope. The Accords embody a fundamental truth, a truth that gathers strength with each passing season, and that will not be denied -- the truth that, like the first Finnish settlers in America, all our ancient peoples find themselves today in a new world, and that, as those early settlers discovered, the greatest creative and moral force in this new world, the greatest hope for survival and success, for peace and happiness, is human freedom.

Yes, freedom -- the right to speak, to print, to assemble, to travel, the right to worship and believe, the right to be different, the right, as the American philosopher, Henry David Thoreau, wrote, "to step to the music [of]... a different drummer." This is freedom as most Europeans and Americans understand it and freedom as it is embodied in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and, yes, in the Helsinki Accords. And -- far more than the locomotive or the automobile, the airplane or the rocket, more than radio, television or the computer -- this concept of liberty is the most distinct, peculiar, and powerful invention of the civilization we all share.

Indeed, without this freedom there would have been no mechanical inventions, for inventions are eccentricities. The men and women who create them are visionaries, just like artists and writers. They see what others fail to see and trust their insights when others don't. The same freedom that permits literature and the arts to flourish, the same freedom that allows one to attend church, synagogue, or mosque without apprehension, that same freedom from oppression and supervision is the freedom that has given us -- the peoples of Western Europe and North America -- our dynamism, our economic growth, and our inventiveness. Together with Japan, Australia, and many others, we have lived in this state of freedom, this House of Democracy since the end of the Second World War. The House of Democracy is a House whose doors are open to all. Because of it, because of the liberty and popular rule we have shared, today we also share

a prosperity more widely distributed and extensive, a political order more tolerant and humane than has ever before been known on earth.

To see not simply the immediate but the historic importance of this, we should remember how far so many of our nations have traveled -- and how desolate the future of freedom and democracy once seemed. There is a story that illustrates what I'm saying. It was shortly after the Second World War, and George Orwell recalled saying to Arthur Koestler that "History stopped in 1936," to which Koestler "nodded in immediate understanding." Orwell added that "we were both thinking of totalitarianism."

For much of this century, the totalitarian temptation, in one form or another, has beckoned to mankind, also promising freedom -- but of a different kind than the one we celebrate today. This concept of liberty is, as the Czechoslovak writer Milan [Muh-LAHN] Kundera [Kun-DARE-ah] has put it, "the age-old dream of a world where everybody would live in harmony, united by a single common will and faith, without secrets from one another" -- the freedom of imposed perfection.

Fifty, forty, even as recently as thirty years ago, the contest between this utopian concept of freedom on one hand and the democratic concept of freedom on the other seemed a close one. Promises of a perfect world lured many Western thinkers and millions of others besides. And many believed in the confident prediction of history's inevitable triumph.

Few do today. Just as democratic freedom has proven itself incredibly fertile -- fertile not merely in a material sense, but

also in the abundance it has brought forth in the human spirit -- so too utopianism has proven brutal and barren.

Albert Camus once predicted that, in his words, "when revolution in the name of power and of history becomes a murderous and immoderate mechanism, a new rebellion is consecrated in the name of moderation and of life." Isn't this exactly what we see happening across the mountains and plains of Europe and even beyond the Urals today? In Western Europe, support for utopian ideologies -- including support among intellectuals -- has all but collapsed, while in the non-democratic countries, leaders grapple with the internal contradictions of their system and some ask how they can make that system better and more productive.

In a sense, the frontline in the competition of ideas that has played in Europe and America for more than 70 years has shifted East. Once it was the democracies that doubted their own view of freedom and wondered whether utopian systems might not be better. Today, the doubt is on the other side.

In just two days, I will meet in Moscow with General Secretary Gorbachev. It will be our fourth set of face-to-face talks since 1985. The General Secretary and I have developed a broad agenda for U.S.-Soviet relations -- an agenda linked directly to the agenda of the Final Act.

Yes, as does the Final Act, we will discuss security issues. We will pursue progress in arms reduction negotiations across the board and continue our exchanges on regional issues.

Yes, we will also discuss economic issues, although, as in the Helsinki process, we have seen in recent years how much differences in our systems inhibit expanded ties, and how difficult it is to divorce economic relations from human rights and other elements of the relationship.

And, yes, as our countries did at Helsinki, we will take up other bilateral areas, as well -- including scientific, cultural and people-to-people exchanges, where we have been hard at work identifying new ways to cooperate. In this area, in particular, I believe we'll see some good results before the week is over.

And like the Final Act, our agenda now includes human rights as an integral component. We have developed our dialogue, and put in place new mechanisms for discussion. The General Secretary has spoken often and forthrightly of the problems confronting the Soviet Union. In his campaign to address these shortcomings, he talks of "glasnost" and "perestroika" -- openness and restructuring, words that to our ears have a particularly welcome sound. And since he began his campaign, things have happened that all of us applaud.

The list includes the release from labor camps or exile of people like Andrei Sakharov, Irina Ratushinskaya [rah-toosh-in-sky-ah], Anatoliy Koryagin [core-ee-ah-ghin], Josef Begun, [bay-goan] and many other prisoners of conscience; the publication of books like Dr. Zhivago and Children of the Arbat; the distribution of movies like Repentance, that are critical of aspects of the Soviet past and present; allowing higher levels of emigration; greater toleration of dissent; General Secretary

Gorbachev's recent statements on religious toleration; the beginning of Soviet withdrawal from Afghanistan.

All this is new and good. But at the same time, there is another list, defined not by us but by the standard of the Helsinki Final Act and the sovereign choice of all participants, including the Soviet Union, to subscribe to it. We need look no farther through the Final Act to see where Soviet practice does not -- or does not yet -- measure up to Soviet commitment.

Thirteen years after the Final Act was signed, it is difficult to understand why cases of divided families and blocked marriages should remain on the East-West agenda; or why Soviet citizens who wish to exercise their right to emigrate should be subject to artificial quotas and arbitrary rulings. And what are we to think of the continued suppression of those who wish to practice their religious beliefs? Over three hundred men and women whom the world sees as political prisoners have been released. There remains no reason why the Soviet Union cannot release all people still in jail for expression of political or religious belief,^s or for organizing to monitor the Helsinki Act.

The Soviets talk about a "common European home," and define it largely in terms of geography. But what is it that cements the structure of clear purpose that all our nations pledged themselves to build by their signature of the Final Act? What is it but the belief in the inalienable rights and dignity of every single human being? What is it but a commitment to true pluralist democracy? What is it but a dedication to the universally understood democratic concept of liberty that evolved

from the genius of European civilization? This body of values -- this is what marks, or should mark, the common European home.

Mr. Gorbachev has spoken of, in his words, "the artificiality and temporariness of the bloc-to-bloc confrontation and the archaic nature of the 'iron curtain.'" I join him in this belief, and welcome every sign that the Soviets and their allies are ready, not only to embrace, but to put into practice the values that unify, and, indeed, define contemporary Western European civilization and its grateful American offspring.

Some 30 years ago, during another period of relative openness, the Italian socialist, Pietro Nenni, long a friend of the Soviet Union, warned that it was wrong to think that the relaxation could be permanent in, as he said, "the absence of any system of judicial guarantees." And he added that only democracy and liberty could prevent reversal of the progress underway.

There are a number of steps, which, if taken, would help ensure the deepening and institutionalization of promising reforms. First, the Soviet leaders could agree to tear down the Berlin Wall and all barriers between Eastern and Western Europe. They could join us in making Berlin itself an all-European center of communications, meetings, and travel.

They could also give legal and practical protection to free expression and worship. Let me interject here that at one time Moscow was known as the City of the Forty Forties, because there were 1,600 belfries in the churches of the city. The world welcomes the return of some churches to worship after many years. But there are still relatively few functioning churches, and

almost no bells. Mr. Gorbachev recently said, as he put it, "believers are Soviet people, workers, patriots, and they have the full right to express their conviction with dignity." I applaud Mr. Gorbachev's statement. What a magnificent demonstration of goodwill it would be for the Soviet leadership for church bells to ring out again not only in Moscow but throughout the Soviet Union.

But beyond these particular steps, there is a deeper question. How can the countries of the East not only grant but guarantee the protection of rights?

The thought and practice of centuries has pointed the way. As the French constitutional philosopher, Montesquieu, wrote more than 200 years ago, "there is no liberty, if the judiciary power be not separated" from the other powers of government. And, like the complete independence of the judiciary, popular control over those who make the laws provides a vital, practical guarantee of human rights. So does the secret ballot. So does the freedom of citizens to associate and act for political purposes or for free collective bargaining.

I know that for the Eastern countries such steps are difficult, and some may say it is unrealistic to call for them. Some said, in 1975, that the standards set forth in the Final Act were unrealistic; that the comprehensive agenda it embodied was unrealistic. Some said, earlier in this decade, that calling for global elimination of an entire class of U.S. and Soviet intermediate-range nuclear missiles was unrealistic; that calling for 50 percent reductions in U.S. and Soviet strategic offensive

arms was unrealistic; that the Soviets would never withdraw from Afghanistan. Is it realistic to pretend that rights are truly protected when there are no effective safeguards against arbitrary rule? Is it realistic, when the Soviet leadership itself is calling for glasnost and democratization, to say that judicial guarantees, or the independence of the judiciary, or popular control over those who draft the laws, or freedom to associate for political purposes, are unrealistic? And, finally, is it realistic to say that peace is truly secure when political systems are less than open?

We believe that realism is on our side when we say that peace and freedom can only be achieved together, but that they can indeed be achieved together if we are prepared to drive toward that goal. So did the leaders who met in this room to sign the Final Act. They were visionaries of the most practical kind. In shaping our policy toward the Soviet Union, in preparing for my meetings with the General Secretary, I have taken their vision -- a shared vision, subscribed to by East, West, and the proud neutral and non-aligned countries of this continent -- as my guide. I believe the standard the framers of the Final Act set -- including the concept of liberty it embodies -- is a standard for all of us. We can do no less than uphold it and try to see it turn, as the Soviets say, into "life itself."

We in the West will remain firm in our values; strong and vigilant in defense of our interests; ready to negotiate honestly for results of mutual and universal benefit. One lesson we drew

again from the events leading up to the Intermediate-range Nuclear Forces Treaty was that, in the world as it is today, peace truly does depend on Western strength and resolve. It is a lesson we will continue to heed.

But we are also prepared to work with the Soviets and their allies whenever they are ready to work with us. By strength we do not mean diktat, that is, an imposed settlement; we mean confident negotiation. The road ahead may be long -- but not so long as our countries had before them 44 years ago when Finland's great President, J.K. Paasikivi [PAH-skah-vee],^{SP} told a nation that had shown the world uncommon courage in a harrowing time: "A path rises up the slope from the floor of the valley. At times the ascent is gradual, at other times steeper. But all the time one comes closer and closer to free, open spaces, above which God's ever brighter sky can be seen. The way up will be difficult.... But every step will take us closer to open vistas."

I believe that in Moscow, Mr. Gorbachev and I can take another step toward a brighter future and a safer world. And I believe that, for the sake of all our ancient peoples, this new world must be a place both of democratic freedom and of peace. It must be a world in which the spirit of the Helsinki Final Act guides all our countries like a great beacon of hope to all mankind for ages to come.

Thank you, God bless you, and bear with me now, Onnea ja memestysta koko suomen kansalle. [OHN-nee-uh yah MEN-es-tuss-ta

coco SWO-men CAHN-soll-la] (This means: "Happiness and success
to all the people of Finland.")

262ND STORY of Level 1 printed in FULL format.

Proprietary to the United Press International 1984

December 17, 1984, Monday, AM cycle

SECTION: International

LENGTH: 111 words

HEADLINE: Foreign News Briefs

DATELINE: LONDON

KEYWORD: Fornbriefs

BODY:

Soviet Politburo member Mikhail Gorbachev met with British officials Monday at King Henry VIII's Hampton Court palace and again voiced his opposition to President Reagan's proposed 'Star Wars' defense system, British sources said.

'I like Mr. Gorbachev. We can do business together,' said Prime Minister Margaret Thatcher, who met the man considered the heir apparent to Soviet leadership for more than five hours Sunday.

But London's Times newspaper said the new Soviet friendliness after a year of deep-freeze relations was a technique aimed at blocking U.S. development of Reagan's anti-missile space weapons, which are still in the development stage.

LEVEL 1 - 5 DOCUMENTS

1. Public Papers of the Presidents, Danville, Indiana, Remarks to Community Leaders., 23 Weekly Comp. Pres. Doc. 801, July 13, 1987, 1252 words
2. Public Papers of the Presidents, Mid-America Committee, Remarks at a White House Briefing on American Competitiveness., 23 Weekly Comp. Pres. Doc. 189, February 25, 1987, 1431 words
3. Public Papers of the Presidents, Costa Mesa, California, Remarks at a Republican Party Rally., 22 Weekly Comp. Pres. Doc. 1525, November 3, 1986, 2704 words
4. Public Papers of the Presidents, National Corn Growers Association, Remarks at the Association's Annual Convention in Des Moines, Iowa., 18 Weekly Comp. Pres. Doc. 983, August 2, 1982, 3002 words
5. Public Papers of the Presidents, International Youth Exchange Programs, Remarks at a White House Meeting of Program Representatives and Supporters., 18 Weekly Comp. Pres. Doc. 692, May 24, 1982, 1263 words

Remarks mentioning IOWA

1ST DOCUMENT of Level 1 printed in KWIC format.

Public Papers of the Presidents

Meeting With Soviet General Secretary Gorbachev in
Reykjavik, Iceland

Radio Address to the Nation.

22 Weekly Comp. Pres. Doc. 1329

October 4, 1986

LENGTH: 1648 words

... Gorbachev and I first met a year ago in Geneva. We spent about 5 hours alone; and more than 15 hours together with the rest of our delegations. Believe me, we learned, again, the truth of the statement: Nations don't mistrust each other because they're armed; they're armed because they mistrust each other. On this point, I was very blunt and candid with Mr. Gorbachev and told him that in our view the source of that mistrust was the Soviet Union's record of seeking to ...

261ST STORY of Level 1 printed in FULL format.

Proprietary to the United Press International 1984

December 17, 1984, Monday, PM cycle

SECTION: International

LENGTH: 625 words

BYLINE: By ARTHUR HERMAN

DATELINE: LONDON

KEYWORD: Gorbachev

BODY:

Soviet Politburo member Mikhail Gorbachev met with British officials today at King Henry VIII's historic Hampton Court and again voiced his opposition to President Reagan's proposed 'Star Wars' space weapons system, British sources said.

'I like Mr. Gorbachev. We can do business together,' said Prime Minister Margaret Thatcher, who met the man considered the heir apparent to Soviet leadership for over five hours Sunday.

But London's Times newspaper said the new Soviet friendliness after a year of deep-freeze relations was a technique aimed at blocking U.S. development of Reagan's anti-missile space weapons, which are still in the development stage.

Gorbachev met for almost three hours with Foreign Secretary Sir Geoffrey Howe at Hampton Court, the 16th century palace that was the favorite of King Henry VIII, British sources said. Then the two sides retired to a baronial hall for lunch.

'The talks were friendly, substantive, businesslike ... and relaxed,' a British source said. 'They spent a great deal of time on East-West relations and arms control.' He said that the Russian basically restated his country's positions on the topics covered and did not break new ground.

He said Gorbachev, considered the second most powerful man in the Kremlin behind President Konstantin Chernenko, made a long presentation on the question of 'prevention of militarization of space.'

Police sealed off the popular tourist attraction 15 miles west of London. Gorbachev along with his aides pulled up in an eight-car motorcade.

The fast-rising Soviet official arrived in London Saturday at the head of a 30-member parliamentary delegation on an eight-day tour of Britain as guest of a British parliamentary group.

Sunday, Gorbachev lunched with Thatcher at her country home of Chequers. Afterward, the two met for almost three hours. British officials called the talks 'very friendly.'

A British source said Gorbachev and Thatcher 'talked at length about the whole of arms control negotiations.'

Proprietary to the United Press International, December 17, 1984

'They are as concerned as we are about preventing the arms race in space,' he said. 'Both expressed a clear interest in avoiding an arms race in space.'

'Summit of Smiles,' headlined the Daily Express.

But in its lead editorial, The Times said the cordial Soviet attitude was nothing but 'the time-worn technique of Soviet diplomacy, whose traditional tenet of foreign policy is to exploit real or potential divisions within the Western alliance ...'

'The change of technique which we are now witnessing is merely a recognition of changed circumstances,' The Times said.

A British source rejected suggestions that Thatcher was indirectly criticizing President Reagan's new space technology, which is known as 'Star Wars' strategy. She supported the U.S. negotiating position while expressing concern over nuclear weapons in space, he said.

In a weekend interview with LWT television, Foreign Office Minister Malcolm Rifkind said, 'We have a British view to put forward. We do not want to see outer space becoming a further threat to the peace of mankind.'

At their meeting at Chequers Sunday, Gorbachev, 53, read out to the British prime minister a personal message from Chernenko setting forth 'the positive attitude' with which Moscow approaches the meeting next month in Geneva between Secretary of State George Shultz and Soviet Foreign Minister Andrei Gromyko on resuming arms control talks.

However, the sources said Gorbachev gave Thatcher no specific message to deliver to President Reagan when she goes to Washington Dec. 24.

Gorbachev, the highest-ranking Soviet official to visit Britain since the late Prime Minister Alexei Kosygin in 1967, is a member of the Kremlin's ruling 12-man Politburo.

June - 391
UN

Speech

"Because they are part of my family," Gandhi replied. From India he sent each a watch engraved "With love from M. K. Gandhi."

19 Children of God

"I have come back empty-handed," Gandhi told the mammoth crowd which received him at Bombay as he stepped down the gangplank on December 28th. But "judging by the warmth, cordiality, and affection displayed at the reception, one would think the Mahatma had returned with Swaraj in the hollow of his hand," Subhas Chandra Bose remarked caustically. He had returned with integrity unimpaired and good will abounding. "I am not conscious of a single experience throughout my three months in England and Europe," he reported, "that made me feel that after all East is East and West is West. On the contrary, I have been convinced more than ever that human nature is much the same, no matter under what clime it flourishes, and that if you approached people with trust and affection, you would have ten-fold trust and thousand-fold affection returned to you."

Exactly a week later he was in jail.

Lord Willingdon had replaced Irwin as Viceroy, and in October, 1931, a new government took office in England with Ramsay MacDonald as Prime Minister, to be sure, but Conservatives filling key posts. Sir Samuel Hoare was Secretary of State for India. Within several weeks, Emergency Powers Ordinances were proclaimed in Bengal, the United Provinces, and the Northwest Frontier Province, where Congress was charged with endeavoring to obstruct the British government by setting up a parallel government. "The question is," Sir Harry Haig, Home Member (Minister of Interior) of the Government of India declared, "whether the Congress is going to impose its will on the whole country."

Jawaharlal Nehru and many other leaders had already been imprisoned, and now Gandhi was lodged in Yeravda jail; he was soon joined by Vallabhbhai Patel, whom Gandhi had dubbed "Sardar" or noble man, and Mahadev Desai.

The
Essential
Gandhi

His Life, Work, and Ideas



AN ANTHOLOGY



71-43993

Edited by

LOUIS FISCHER

ARLINGTON COUNTY PUBLIC LIBRARY



VINTAGE BOOKS
A DIVISION OF RANDOM HOUSE
New York

THE WHITE HOUSE
WASHINGTON

May 13, 1982-#2

TO: Tony
FROM: Julie
RE: Chariots of Fire Quote

Attached are the quote from the book from the movie, and the original Bible verse.

Note: Magnusson's bio of Eric Liddell, The Flying Scotsman, says that "there is not a scrap of evidence" that Liddell really read this passage, but that he did attend church services that day, and would likely have been familiar with the Isiah verse.

On Sunday, while the 100-meter heats were being run, Eric Liddell preached a sermon in the Church of Scotland in the center of Paris. As he surveyed the large congregation, part of his mind kept thinking of the Olympic runners lining up and how he wished he were among them. Yet he had made the right decision. He had no doubt of that.

"My text this afternoon is taken from Isaiah, Chapter Forty," he said in a firm voice that carried through the still, silent church. "Behold, the nations are as a drop in the bucket and are counted as the small dust in the balance. . . ." He thought of the Prince of Wales and the pressure he had brought to

bear. “. . . All nations before Him are as nothing. They are counted to Him less than nothing . . . and vanity. . . He bringeth the princes to nothing; He maketh the judges of the earth as a vanity. . .” The starter’s pistol would go off at any moment. The runners, including Harold Abrahams, would be poised ready for a fast start. “. . . Hast thou not known? Hast thou not heard that the everlasting God, the Lord, the Creator of the ends of the earth, fainteth not, neither is weary. . .”

At that moment, the starter’s pistol cracked at the Olympic Stadium. Moments before, the American Charles Paddock had rocked forward deliberately and Harold, watching him, rocked with him, then realizing his mistake, quickly shifted back. But as he did so, the pistol went off. Paddock was ready and off to a great start, but Harold, conned, lost a precious moment and was left a yard behind. The power within Harold surged, giving him an agonized expression as he strained to catch Paddock.

From the church pulpit, Eric continued to read from the Old Testament: “He giveth power to the faint, and to them that have no might, He increaseth strength. . . . But they that wait upon the Lord shall renew their strength. . . . They shall mount up with wings as eagles. They shall run and not be weary. . . .”



CHARIOTS OF FIRE

A TRUE STORY

WRITTEN BY
W. J. WEATHERBY

BASED ON A SCREENPLAY BY
COLIN WELLAND

A Dell/Quicksilver Book

King James

40 COMFORT ye, comfort ye my people, saith your God.

2 Speak ye comfortably to Jerusalem, and cry unto her, that her warfare is accomplished, that her iniquity is pardoned: for she hath received of the LORD's hand double for all her sins.

3 ¶ The voice of him that crieth in the wilderness, Prepare ye the way of the LORD, make straight in the desert a highway for our God.

4 Every valley shall be exalted, and every mountain and hill shall be made low: and the crooked shall be made straight, and the rough places plain:

5 And the glory of the LORD shall be revealed, and all flesh shall see it together: for the mouth of the LORD hath spoken it.

6 The voice said, Cry. And he said, What shall I cry? All flesh is grass, and all the goodliness thereof is as the flower of the field:

7 The grass withereth, the flower fadeth: because the spirit of the LORD bloweth upon it: surely the people is grass.

8 The grass withereth, the flower fadeth: but the word of our God shall stand for ever.

9 ¶ O Zion, that bringest good tidings, get thee up into the high mountain; O Jerusalem, that bringest good tidings, lift up thy voice with strength; lift it up, be not afraid; say unto the cities of Judah, Behold your God!

10 Behold, the Lord GOD will come with strong hand, and his arm shall rule for him: behold, his reward is with him, and his work before him.

11 He shall feed his flock like a shepherd: he shall gather the lambs with his arm, and carry them in his bosom, and shall gently lead those that are with young.

12 ¶ Who hath measured the waters in the hollow of his hand, and meted out heaven with the span, and comprehended the dust of the earth in a measure, and weighed the mountains in scales, and the hills in a balance?

13 Who hath directed the Spirit of the LORD, or being his counsellor hath taught him?

14 With whom took he counsel, and who instructed him, and taught him in the path of judgment, and taught him knowledge, and shewed to him the way of understanding?

15 Behold, the nations are as a drop of a bucket, and are counted as the small dust of the balance: behold, he taketh up the isles as a very little thing.

16 And Lēb-ā-non is not sufficient to burn, nor the beasts thereof sufficient for a burnt offering.

17 All nations before him are as nothing; and they are counted to him less than nothing, and vanity.

18 ¶ To whom then will ye liken God? or what likeness will ye compare unto him?

19 The workman melteth a graven image, and the goldsmith spreadeth it over with gold, and casteth silver chains.

20 He that is so impoverished that he hath no oblation chooseth a tree that will not rot; he seeketh unto him a cunning workman to prepare a graven image, that shall not be moved.

21 Have ye not known? have ye not heard? hath it not been told you from the beginning? have ye not understood from the foundations of the earth?

22 It is he that sitteth upon the circle of the earth, and the inhabitants thereof are as grass-

hoppers; that stretcheth out the heavens as a curtain, and spreadeth them out as a tent to dwell in:

23 That bringeth the princes to nothing; he maketh the judges of the earth as vanity.

24 Yea, they shall not be planted; yea, they shall not be sown: yea, their stock shall not take root in the earth: and he shall also blow upon them, and they shall wither, and the whirlwind shall take them away as stubble.

25 To whom then will ye liken me, or shall I be equal? saith the Holy One.

26 Lift up your eyes on high, and behold who hath created these things, that bringeth out their host by number: he calleth them all by names by the greatness of his might, for that he is strong in power; not one faileth.

27 Why sayeth thou, O Jacob, and speakest, O Israel, My way is hid from the LORD, and my judgment is passed over from my God?

28 ¶ Hast thou not known? hast thou not heard, that the everlasting God, the LORD, the Creator of the ends of the earth, fainteth not, neither is weary? there is no searching of his understanding.

29 He giveth power to the faint; and to them that have no might he increaseth strength.

30 Even the youths shall faint and be weary, and the young men shall utterly fall:

31 But they that wait upon the LORD shall renew their strength; they shall mount up with wings as eagles; they shall run, and not be weary; and they shall walk, and not faint.

41 KEEP silence before me, O islands; and let the people renew their strength: let them come near; then let them speak: let us come near together to judgment.

2 Who raised up the righteous man from the east, called him to his foot, gave the nations before him, and made him rule over kings? he gave them as the dust to his sword, and as driven stubble to his bow.

3 He pursued them, and passed safely; even by the way that he had not gone with his feet.

4 Who hath wrought and done it, calling the generations from the beginning? I the LORD, the first, and with the last; I am he.

5 The isles saw it, and feared; the ends of the earth were afraid, drew near, and came.

6 They helped every one his neighbour; and every one said to his brother, Be of good courage.

7 So the carpenter encouraged the goldsmith, and he that smootheneth with the hammer him that smote the anvil, saying, It is ready for the sodering: and he fastened it with nails, that it should not be moved.

8 But thou, Israel, art my servant, Jacob whom I have chosen, the seed of Abraham my friend.

9 Thou whom I have taken from the ends of the earth, and called thee from the chief men thereof, and said unto thee, Thou art my servant; I have chosen thee, and not cast thee away.

10 ¶ Fear thou not; for I am with thee: be not dismayed; for I am thy God: I will strengthen thee; yea, I will help thee; yea, I will uphold thee with the right hand of my righteousness.

11 Behold, all they that were incensed against thee shall be ashamed and confounded: they shall be as nothing; and they that strive with thee shall perish.