

Ronald Reagan Presidential Library
Digital Library Collections

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

Collection: Dolan, Anthony: Files
Folder Title: Presidential Address to the Nation:
Geneva Summit (Dolan-White) 11/14/1985 (5)
Box: 38

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/>

(Dolan)
November 4, 1985
2:00 p.m.

PRESIDENTIAL ADDRESS: TO THE NATION -- GENEVA SUMMIT

In 48 hours, I will be leaving for Geneva to meet with Mr. Gorbachev, the leader of the Soviet Union. Very few events attract as much attention as summit conferences and I felt it was my duty to report directly to you tonight on this meeting and its significance.

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

Believe me, the office I now occupy leads to serious reflection on all this. Whenever I travel, for example, I am followed by a military aide who carries with him a small black attache case -- "the football" is its nickname. It is a grim reminder of the narrow line our world walks every day because it contains the codes necessary for retaliation to a nuclear attack on the United States.

And this office provides another sobering, even sadder perspective on our world, one I will talk about to Mr. Gorbachev in a few days, one I want to mention to you now. The 23 million lives lost since the end of World War II in conventional and regional conflicts are stark evidence that a strictly nuclear conflict is far from the only danger we face. In recent years, America has had her share of fallen sons; Korea, Vietnam, other military engagements including terrorist attacks have been part of this terrible cost. And many times at this desk I have had to discharge the most difficult duty I have as President: to try and find words of comfort for grieving mothers and fathers. I don't have to tell you how regularly I fail at that; ~~only because~~ *because* there are no such words. It's one reason why earlier this year when I visited those places in Europe that had seen so much suffering during World War II, I said a voice could be heard there, a voice from our century and from every century, the same voice I have heard in such sorrow here in this room, the voice of humanity crying out in anguish but in hope for peace -- and for ^{an} ~~the~~ end to war.

And in

This is why I go to Geneva. For peace. ~~In~~ hope -- the hope of never having to face that awful option of nuclear retaliation; the hope of never again having to speak from this office to grief-stricken loved ones, the hope that someday our Nation and the Soviet Union and all the people of the world will learn to heed the age-old cry of mankind for peace among all nations.

There is another reason I go to Geneva. It has to do, like the threat of nuclear war, with a danger unique to this century. Part of our heritage as Americans is ~~are~~ ^{or} awareness of the dangers of ~~government that overreaches, our~~ Founding Fathers ~~knew~~ ^{warning about} history's most terrible but, somehow most easily forgotten lesson; that the abuse of government power has always posed the most serious and enduring threat to the freedom of man.

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

Now I don't think I have to elaborate on the human suffering and the loss of life totalitarian government has caused in ~~this~~ ^{an} century. ^{time.} Hitler's concentration camps or Stalin's purges, the Third Reich or the Gulag Archipelago, the advent of totalitarian ideology -- an ideology which justifies any crime or affront to the individual done in the name of the state -- has sparked the worse assault ^s in history on the human spirit. On this point, my own views have been plainly stated many times in the past; only as recently as a few weeks ago, I spoke of some specific

instances of unacceptable Soviet conduct: the invasion of Afghanistan, one that has cost between 750,000 and one million lives not to mention nearly six million refugees, Soviet intervention in the African nations of Angola and Ethiopia, Soviet attempts to establish a totalitarian regime in Nicaragua and undermine democracy in this hemisphere. ~~this~~ this tragic, unhappy list goes on.

I need not elaborate on ~~all~~ ^{the} of this ~~except~~ except to say that in forthrightly opposing such action we Americans have a grave responsibility and bear a special burden. I think as people we have always faced up to this reality. As one friend of mine known for expressing himself in a classic American way, Gary Cooper, put it: "From what I hear about communism, I don't like it because it isn't on the level." ~~well~~, ~~A~~ belief in the dignity of the individual and in his or her worth in the sight of God did give birth to this country; it is central to our being. "Our whole experiment is based on the capacity of the people for self-government," said James Madison. And Thomas Jefferson said more directly: "The mass of men were not born to wear saddles on their backs," and again, "The God who gave us life, gave us liberty as well." This is our past, it is a part of us, we must never deny nor forsake it. If the day ever comes when the leaders of this Nation remain silent in the face of foreign aggression or stop speaking out about the repression of human rights then truly the cause of America -- the cause of freedom -- has been lost, and the great heart of this country has been broken. We Americans know we can never rest as a people nor ^{say} call

our work as a Nation ^{is} done until each man, woman and child on earth knows the blessings of liberty.

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

But let me stress here that not only do I believe this ~~at this time~~ candor and realism on behalf of freedom is our responsibility as Americans, I also think it ~~makes long term sense for the negotiating process~~ and is essential for success in Geneva. Because if history has shown there is any key to dealing successfully with the Soviets it is this: the Soviets must realize that their counterparts take them seriously and that, above all, we harbor no illusions about their ultimate goals and intentions. The Soviet mind is not the mirror image of the American or the Western mind and it is both wrong and arrogant to assume that it is. The Soviets have a very different view of the world than we do; they believe a great struggle is already underway in the world and true peace can only be attained with the triumph of communist power. The Soviets sincerely believe then that the march of history is embodied in the Soviet state, and so, to them, the mere existence of the democracies is seen as an obstacle to the ultimate triumph of history and that state. So, from the Soviet perspective, even if the democracies do nothing overt against their interests, just our survival, our mere existence, is considered by them an act of aggression †

~~against themselves and against the predetermined course of history.~~

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

serious All of this is why, after a long experience of negotiating with the Soviets, Winston Churchill ~~advised Western diplomats to never forget.~~ "The Soviets... ~~[have no understanding of such words as honesty, honor, trust and truth - in fact, they regard these as negative virtues. They~~ will try every door in the home, enter all rooms which are not locked and when they come to a house that is barred, if they are unsuccessful in breaking through it, they will withdraw and invite you to dine genially that same evening."

Sheet A

So I must be blunt with you tonight; while I go to Geneva for peace and for freedom, I also go to Geneva without illusions. Let us be clear: the fact of this summit conference does not mean the Soviets have forsaken their long-term goals and objectives. Let us never forget, as President Eisenhower put it

in his farewell address to the American people; "we face a hostile ideology -- global in scope, atheistic in character, ruthless in purpose and insidious in method."

I do not mention ^{all} ~~this~~ ^{here} ~~(to sound unduly pessimistic~~ ~~however,~~ or to paint a heedlessly discouraging picture. Far to the contrary, my mood about this meeting is one of cautious optimism; ^{and} while it would be foolhardy to think one summit conference can establish a permanent peace, this conference can, I believe, help begin a permanent process towards peace. Even beyond this, however, I want to talk in a moment about why I believe there is great cause for hope in the direction of many events now taking place in the world; cause to believe the enormous sacrifices the American people have been making since the end of World War II to preserve freedom are finally paying off.

And in one sense, this summit conference is evidence of that; and that is why we must be realistic about its prospects. ^{realism is so essential.}

For only by leaving our illusions behind and dealing realistically with the Soviets do we have any chance at all for meaningful progress in Geneva. The Soviets understand firmness of mind and ~~strength of will~~; and I can assure you that is what

~~they will see on the American side in Geneva.~~

Because ~~then~~ we can neither permit civilization to perish in a nuclear holocaust nor freedom to wither under the steady and relentless assault of totalitarianism. ^{our} ~~Our~~ ^{next} ~~goals~~ ^{goals} in Geneva ~~and~~

~~over the long-term~~ ^{but the} are both peace and freedom ~~and an end to~~ ^{as well as} illusion.

4
130+
that is
why
realism
is
so
essential

This is the way
to progress; as Winston
Churchill said
insert
A

But if nuclear war is an impossible option and so too is a world under totalitarian rule, how then are we to steer between them? How do we confront this dilemma in Geneva and elsewhere? What course are we to chart and what cause is their for hope?

My fellow Americans, I believe there is great cause for hope -- hope that peace and freedom will not only survive but triumph, and perhaps even sooner than any of us had even dared to imagine ^{only} a few years ago. I ~~believe~~ ^{also think} it is possible that history will record a great paradox ^{about an} ~~the~~ century that ^{created it} gave birth to the awful menaces of nuclear weapons and totalitarian government and saw so much bloodshed and heartache ^{it} was also the century that in its closing decades fostered the greatest movement in human memory towards free institutions and democratic self-rule, the greatest flowering of mankind's age old aspiration for freedom and human dignity. ⁹ Consider, for a moment, that at the start of the twentieth century there were only a handful of democracies in the entire world while today there are more than 50 with one-third of the world's population living in freedom. Here in our own hemisphere there is dramatic evidence of this change: more than 90 percent of the people in Latin America are now living under governments that are either democratic or headed in that direction, a dramatic reversal from only a few years ago.

Even the communist world is far from immune to this worldwide movement. In an astonishing turnaround from only a few years ago, ~~for example,~~ ^{for example,} China has adopted sweeping economic reforms. ^{And} Many Eastern European nations even now are seeking ^{through some free-market techniques} ~~higher and~~ higher standards of living ~~for their people and~~

and although for the moment Polish Solidarity has been suppressed we know the hunger of the Polish people for freedom can never be *completely* stilled. *A* So we see even in the communist world, the great longing for personal freedom and democratic self-rule, the realization that economic progress is directly tied to the operation of a free market, surfacing again and again. That's because ~~in a sense~~ *in one sense* Karl Marx was right; the demand for economic well-being in this century has brought ~~the~~ *the* masses into conflict with the old political order; only ~~Marx~~ *he* was wrong ~~in predicting where~~ *about* this conflict would occur. ~~Contrary to Marx's theory,~~ *It* is the democracies that are vibrant and growing -- bringing to their people higher and higher standards of living even as freedom grows and deepens. ~~But~~ *while* the communist world ~~is~~ *has* where economies stagnate, technology lags and the people ~~are~~ *who* restless and unhappy with their lives.

and In the Soviet Union too, ~~severe~~ economic difficulties ~~are~~ *have* ~~leading~~ *led* to reappraisal and reexamination. Mr. Gorbachev himself has spoken to this issue and I intend to engage him further on this matter when we meet. Without being overly optimistic we should recognize that it has happened before in history: a small ruling elite -- when it meets firm resistance to adventures ~~against foreign lands~~ *foreign* ~~73~~ *aim* begins to ponder how to lend more legitimacy to its government by allowing the people more of voice in their own destiny.

And think what this would mean for the prospects of arms control and peace; consider what a process of democratization within the Soviet Union might contribute. Public involvement in

the peace initiatives would grow as it has in the West and the enormous Soviet military budget -- nearly 15 percent of the gross national product -- would suddenly be subjected to public scrutiny as it is here in the West. And one of the central difficulties in negotiating arms control agreements -- the problem of verification -- could be dramatically eased. Above all, the suspicion and distrust which is endemic to closed political systems, and which so poisons the mutual pursuit of peace by the Soviet Union and the United States, would be greatly alleviated.

Now, don't get me wrong, I hardly think we've reached this situation, not by a long shot. But, my fellow Americans, I do believe that there is a historic trend towards ~~freedom~~ ^{more openness} and more openness in the world ^{and demands} even in communist countries ^{and that} and the momentum is building ^{- this direction.} But because, unlike the Soviets, we believe that history has no unalterable laws, ^{we must do all} that what happens in the world depends on hard work and our freely exercised choice ^{in our power to strengthen and accelerate this} ~~and our freely exercised choice~~ ^{to strengthen and} I want to cite some of the reasons for this trend and explain how ~~to strengthen and~~ ^{accelerate this trend.} ~~most~~ ^{let us start by} I think we can add to its momentum. ^{understanding that} ~~changes~~ ^{changes} the important factors. ^{that} ^{more} ^{contributes} ^{to} ^{this} ^{movement,}

To begin with, the health and vigor of the American economy -- with 15 million new jobs -- has been restored; and this in turn had led to a reinvigoration of the world economy, a lessening of international tension and a new appreciation by many nations for the pragmatics of freedom. Many more people and governments understand today that freedom is fruitful, that freedom works. And that is why it is especially important to

keep our economy vigorous and expanding by moving here at home on initiatives like deficit reduction and tax reform.

Second, our efforts to restore America's military might has brought with it a new appreciation by the rest of the world for American power, resolve and confidence. But this job is not yet completed. ~~As I mentioned earlier,~~ [§] since the postwar period the American people have sacrificed enormously to provide for the defense of the free world; let us not at the very moment when that willingness to sacrifice is beginning to pay dividends relax our vigilance or vigor.

Third, this item I am about to discuss is actually related to our defense buildup but because I believe it is so vital to the peace process I wanted to treat it separately. As most of you know, the United States and the Soviet Union have for many years used massive nuclear arsenals to hold each other hostage in a kind of mutual nuclear terror -- one side threatening massive retaliation against the other. This has been known as mutual assured destruction; M-A-D or M.A.D. as the arms control experts call it. I think you will agree there has never been a more apt acronym. As perhaps most of you also know, the United States is now embarked on research and development of new strategic defense system -- an intricate but very workable series of defenses that could provide a shield in outer space against incoming nuclear missiles. We believe this system could be partly deployed at the end of this decade or the early part of the 1990's.

Now we have embarked on this program for a single reason: to end the madness of MAD, the insanity of mutual nuclear terror.

Think what the advent of this new space shield -- a defensive system that would kill weapons not people -- could mean to our lives and the lives of our children. For the first time much of the dread of the postwar period would be lifted because we would have some means as a people to protect ourselves from a nuclear attack launched either by design or by mistake.

Now I must tell you when I made the decision to go ahead with this program several years ago, I heard much well-intended advice urging me to either delay or not ^{to} take this course at all. But some decisions in any Presidency must be made alone; ^{and} it was so in this case, ^{But} and I think we are already seeing evidence this was the correct course to choose. At first, many derided this proposal as unworkable calling it "star wars"; but as ~~our~~ research ^{effort has} continued ~~and~~ the system ^{has become} increasingly feasible ^{and} this negative mood ~~is changing~~ ^{has altered}.

The Soviets of course have been working on their own defensive system; much less capable than ours but nonetheless one in which they have moved from the research stage to the deployment stage. They have already, for example, installed a huge new radar system and computer network that would be the brains of any such system, a clear violation of the terms of the A.B.M. Treaty signed by our two countries in 1972. But because they are aware of our technological advantage, the Soviets are deeply frightened by our resolve to move ahead with our space shield; they have launched a massive propaganda offensive designed to convince the world our defensive system is

"destabilizing" even as they move vigorously ahead with their own.

So that is why I believe moving forward with our strategic defense initiative and making sure this system is not given up or negotiated away in Geneva is a third important step towards peace and freedom.

Fourth, we must continue with a foreign policy that offers a wide range of peace initiatives even as it speaks out vigorously for freedom. Yes, we have been candid about the difference between the Soviets and ourselves and we have been willing to use our military power when our vital interests were threatened. And I think we can be pleased with the results: for the first time in many years not a single square inch of real estate has been lost to communist aggression, in fact, Grenada has been rescued from such a fate and in at least four other countries freedom fighters are now opposing the rule of totalitarian leaders. But in addition to these firm foreign policy steps, we have also set in motion a wide series of diplomatic initiatives, perhaps the greatest number of such proposals in our history. They cover a range of areas: strategic nuclear weapons, intermediate nuclear weapons, chemical weapons, mutual troop reductions in Europe, and the list goes on.

And it is in this last area, the business of negotiation between the Soviet Union and the United States that this Geneva meeting takes on a special importance. Too often in the past, the whole burden of Soviet and American relations has rested on one or two arms talks or even arms proposals. And while arms

control is absolutely essential it can not be the only area of discussion between the United States and the Soviet Union. That is why I believe this summit conference can move the peace process substantially forward. After careful consultation with our allies, Secretary Shultz flew to Moscow last week and established with the Soviets a four-fold agenda for discussion. So, we will be discussing in Geneva arms control but also human rights; we will be talking ^{with them} about bilateral matters ~~between our new nations~~ such as trade and scientific and cultural exchanges but also regional disputes such as those in Afghanistan, Angola and the other places I have mentioned.

I think this represents a breakthrough. And I am determined to continue ^{in direction} this in Geneva by offering the Soviets a series of proposals that while not ^{new when taken} individually ~~new~~ do make up when taken in their entirety a unique and even revolutionary approach. With ^{this} a series of "Open World" proposals, I want to invite the Soviet Union to participate more fully in ^{the effort to} ~~this world movement towards~~ ^{reduce} ~~secrecy and distrust between nations and~~ ^{construct a} ~~greater openness, free institutions and democracy~~ ^{more open and constructive relationship.}

First, in my United Nations speech of last year I mentioned a proposal for a series of "Umbrella talks" between the Soviets and ourselves on a wide-ranging number of issues. I will once again offer this proposal, ^{not only} ~~not only by~~ suggesting regular meetings of the two heads of state but meetings at the cabinet and ministerial level as well.

Second, in the area of arms control we will be discussing a wide series of proposals, ~~especially our recent suggestions in~~ Geneva. ~~But~~ ^{In} addition to this ^{he} I want to ^{bring} take up the issue of

our strategic defense initiative. ^{But} Rather than bargaining away this essential system or spending our time in Geneva bickering over who is building what and which side is destabilizing the most; I am going to extend to the Soviets an invitation to share in the fruits of our research and deployment of this space shield.

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

And fourth and finally, ~~I will urge the Soviets to open their mass communications system to representatives of other countries and culture.~~ I've noted that Mr. Gorbachev has shown a lively appreciation for America's free press tradition; I can assure you I will be preaching the virtues of some Soviet movement in this direction as well ^{and} ~~and~~ will ask again, ^{as} ~~we~~ I ^{did} ~~suggested~~ ^{like a snake} several years ago to the British Parliament, for an opportunity to address the Soviet people.

Now I do not think progress on any of these proposals will necessarily be immediate. But I do believe the very fact that ^{such} ~~they~~ ^{proposals} are on the table and under discussion is an event of considerable significance.

To summarize then; I will be going to Geneva for peace and for freedom; without illusions, ~~to~~ to put forward a whole series

of "Open World" proposals that can help lead to a more open and democratic world. *less distrustful international climate,*

I also think the conversations Mr. Gorbachev and I will ~~be~~ *have* ~~having~~ *together can help* ~~can do much to~~ alleviate whatever suspicions and misunderstandings ~~might~~ *now* exist between our two sides. You can be sure the Soviet Union knows the United States is not an aggressor and will never strike first against a foreign adversary. As Prime Minister Mulroney of Canada put it recently when he was told the United States was an imperialist Nation; -- and I'm using the Prime Minister's words, "What the hell do you mean 'imperialist nation.'? We have a 5,000 mile border with them and for 172 years there hasn't been a shot fired in anger."

~~I think Mr. Gorbachev and his colleagues in the Soviet politburo know we are a peaceful nation; and that's why I will be stressing that the only way war can ever break out between our two countries is miscalculation on the part of the Soviet Union.~~

The great danger in the past has been the ~~assumption~~ *failure* by our adversaries that ~~the American people do not love freedom enough~~ *to remember that while we love freedom peace they also* ~~and are~~ *not* to sacrifice for it. ~~No assumption could be more wrong or more dangerous, and I will say so.~~ *That is why I will be stressing to Mr. Gorbachev that the only way war can ever break out between our two countries is such*

My first meeting with Mr. Gorbachev, by the way, will be taking place on the anniversary of the Gettysburg address; ~~you~~ *48* can be certain I will remind him that the American people are as determined as ever that [^]government by the people, for the people and of the people shall not perish from the earth."

In conclusion, ~~I think you can well imagine,~~ my fellow Americans, ~~that~~ *while* this summit conference ~~represents~~ *marks the* a culmination

Part
have always stated
ready

through
such
is
mis
calculation
on
the
part
of
the
Soviets.

up much of our effort in the human policy area it is also

~~of many of the things we have been trying to achieve in our foreign policy. And that it is also a culmination of many things in another way, a milestone in a long personal journey.~~ That quotation from James Madison I mentioned earlier was from a speech that marked my first entry into political life, a speech given more than two decades ago.

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

We have achieved much together and *both Nancy and I are proud and grateful for the trust you have placed in us. And perhaps you can understand why on the eve of our departure for Geneva my thoughts turn to you and her. Not just for all the support and love she has given me over the years but also because I know the hope of peace is deep in her heart as it is in the heart of every American mother.*

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

It is also the story of her son, Nicholas Gage, who grew up to become an investigative reporter with the New York Times and who secretly vowed to return to Greece someday to ~~track down and take vengeance on the man who had sent his mother to death.~~ *her But she and the other* Gage finally finds ~~that man but also find~~ he cannot extract the

vengeance he has promised himself. ~~Yes~~, Mr Gage writes, it would have relieved the pain that had filled him for so many years but it would also have broken the one bridge still connecting him to his mother and the part of him most like her. As he tells it: "her final cry, before the bullets of the firing squad tore into her, was not a curse on her killers but an invocation of what she died for, a declaration of love: 'my children.'"

How that cry echoes down through the centuries, a cry for the children of the world, for peace, for love of ~~neighbor~~ *an Helloman.*

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

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

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

God bless you and good night.

(Dolan)
November 3, 1985
3:00 p.m.

PRESIDENTIAL ADDRESS: TO THE NATION -- GENEVA SUMMIT

In 48 hours, I will be leaving for Geneva to meet with Mr. Gorbachev, the leader of the Soviet Union. Very few events attract as much attention as summit conferences and I felt it was my duty to report directly to you tonight on this meeting and its significance.

Now, I don't think it's any mystery why most of us regard summit conferences as a good idea. ^{the potential we have created by} ~~The danger of thermonuclear~~ war ^{-- the havoc it would wreak --} ~~and the havoc it would wreak~~ is, as President Kennedy put it, a modern sword of Damocles ^{dangling} ~~that~~ ^{here} ~~dangles~~ over the head of each of us. Actually, the awful reality of nuclear weapons is really only a kind of terrible crescendo to the steady, dehumanizing progress of modern warfare itself in this century. To a few people here in this office recently, I recalled a hotly debated issue in my own college years -- which by the way also took place in this century -- when some of us strenuously argued that in the advent of another world war no civilized person and certainly no American would obey an order to attack purely civilian targets. Humanity, we were certain, would never come to that. Well, World War II and 34 million civilian casualties later we were all sadly, tragically wiser. At least today we can say we have fewer illusions: we know a World War III will cause vast and devastating destruction with perhaps 90 percent civilian casualties.

stat
~~~~~

Believe me, the office I now occupy leads to serious reflection on all this <sup>W</sup> whenever I travel, for example, I am followed by a military aide who carries with ~~her~~ <sup>him</sup> a small black attache case -- "the football" is its nickname. It is a grim reminder of the narrow line our world walks every day because it contains the codes necessary for retaliation to a nuclear attack on the United States.

<sup>and</sup> This office provides another sobering, ~~and~~ <sup>and</sup> even sadder perspective <sup>on our world, one I will talk about shortly</sup> ~~one you can be sure I will be speaking about to~~ <sup>about Mr. Gorbachev</sup> ~~Mr. Gorbachev in a few days.~~ The 23 million lives lost since the end of World War II in conventional and regional conflicts are stark evidence that a strictly nuclear conflict is far from the only danger <sup>we</sup> ~~our~~ world faces. In recent years, America has had her share of fallen sons; Korea, Vietnam, other military engagements <sup>including</sup> ~~and~~ <sup>attacks</sup> ~~and~~ terrorist incidents have been part of this terrible cost. <sup>And</sup> ~~And~~ many times at this desk I have had to ~~fulfill~~ <sup>fulfill</sup> the most difficult duty I have as President: to find <sup>the</sup> words of comfort for grieving mothers and fathers. I don't have to tell you how regularly I fail <sup>because</sup> because there are no such words. It's one reason why earlier this year when I visited those places in Europe that had seen so much suffering during World War II, I said a voice could be heard there, a voice from our century and from every century, the same voice I have heard ~~so~~ <sup>so</sup> sorrowfully in this room, the voice of humanity crying out in anguish but in hope ~~d~~ for peace -- and for <sup>the</sup> ~~an~~ end to war.

This is why I go to Geneva. ~~The pursuit~~ <sup>For</sup> of peace. The hope of never having to face that awful option of nuclear retaliation;

*about Mr. Gorbachev about shortly and want to mention this to you now.*

*discharge*

*Samantha here is*

*And in Hope.*

the hope of never again having to speak from this office to grieved <sup>if</sup> ~~and~~ stricken loved ones, the hope that someday our Nation and the Soviet Union and all the people of the world will learn to heed the age-old cry of mankind for peace among all nations.

There is another reason I go to Geneva. It has to do, like the threat of nuclear war, with a danger unique to our century.

As Americans we are aware of the danger of government that overreaches; ~~in recent years we have had to struggle together to~~ <sup>and the</sup> ~~reverse~~ <sup>years</sup> of mindless bureaucracy, burdensome regulation,

stringent taxation and rampant inflation, ~~all of this combining~~ <sup>can stifle</sup> ~~to stifle~~ personal freedom, economic growth and social

excellence. <sup>few know better than our</sup> ~~Our~~ Founding Fathers know that the abuse of

government power has brought <sup>many nations to</sup> ~~economic ruin to many nations in~~ <sup>and led to foreign adventure and war. They left us this</sup> ~~history and that unchecked government power frequently~~ <sup>into</sup> ~~to~~

~~foreign wars~~ and ~~they~~ <sup>had</sup> a special appreciation for history's

most terrible but, somehow, most easily forgotten lesson: that the

abuse of government power <sup>was always</sup> ~~has always~~ posed the most serious and endjuring threat to the freedom of man.

<sup>and</sup> The twentieth century, ~~however has given us, however,~~ <sup>with the</sup> quantum leap ~~in this threat to freedom.~~ The development of science and

technology and the rise of modern ideology, <sup>was given us</sup> ~~has~~ seen the birth of <sup>a quantum</sup> ~~the~~ gravest threat to freedom ever known -- the police state, the totalitarian society.

I <sup>do not</sup> think it <sup>I have</sup> ~~is necessary~~ to elaborate tonight on the human suffering and the loss of life totalitarian governments have caused in this century. Hitler's concentration camps or Stalin's purges, the Third Reich or the Gulag Archipelago, <sup>The</sup>

in the face of that threat to freedom; in various times we have

Handwritten notes on the left margin, including "can stifle" and "few know better than our".

advent of totalitarian ideology -- an ideology which justifies any crime or affront to <sup>the individual</sup> ~~human rights~~ done in the name of the state -- has sparked the worse assault in history on the human spirit. *On this point,*

*My own views on all of this have been plainly stated in the past; I do not think they now need much elaboration. <sup>Just</sup> AS recently as a few weeks ago, I spoke of some specific instances of Soviet conduct: the invasion of Afghanistan, one that has cost between 750,000 and one million lives not to mention nearly six million refugees, Soviet intervention in the African nations of Angola and Ethiopia, Soviet attempts to establish a totalitarian regime in Nicaragua and undermine democracy in this hemisphere; the list goes on.*

*So I go to Geneva with no illusions; and it is my duty as President to remind you not to have any either. One summit conference does not make for a permanent peace, not even a permanent process for peace. Nor does this mean the essential nature of the struggle now going on in the world has been changed or that the Soviets have altered their long-term goals and objectives. We must never forget as President Eisenhower put it in his farewell address to the American people that, "we face a hostile ideology -- global in scope, atheistic in character, ruthless in purpose and insidious in method."*

*I mention this here, however, because*  
*Now I think most of you know that some well-meaning individuals have objected in the past to ~~this sort of~~ candor about communism on my <sup>myself and others</sup> ~~part~~ and members of the Administration. Most of these people don't deny the reality of what we say but*

*genuinely believe this reality is best left in obscurity where it is*

they do ~~not seem to think the reality should be obscured~~, and they

*less*  
~~regard any formal mention as both unnecessarily unpleasant and~~  
*clear likely to disrupt*  
~~possibly upsetting to~~ the diplomatic process.

*was always thought*  
I think this view ~~is~~ wrong, and let me address it now. If

history has shown there is any key to dealing successfully with

the Soviets it is this: *above all, that we* the Soviets must realize that their *we*

counterparts take them seriously, and harbor no illusions about

ultimate Soviet goals and intentions. The Soviet mind is not the

mirror image of the American or Western mind, and it is *with* wrong and

arrogant ~~or dangerous~~ to assume it is. *that* The Soviets believe that

the march of history is embodied in Soviet power, and that the

mere existence of the democracies is an obstacle to ultimate and

*seen by them as* historic triumph of the Soviet state. *So* Even if we do nothing over

~~then against the Soviets, we as a democratic Nation are regarded~~

~~as a threat against their ideology and against history. Our~~

survival, *our mere existence* ~~our very existence~~ then is considered by them as an act

of aggression *against themselves, not theirs; deadly and unjust cruelty.*

That is why any sudden shifts by the Western nations, in our

realistic and long-held views about the Soviets, ~~and~~ especially

any naive public statements minimizing or ~~obscuring~~ the crucial

moral distinction between totalitarianism and democracy *tends to* ~~run~~

risk of seriously disrupting the negotiating process. In the

past, *when such statements have been made,* the Soviets have either regarded such statements as a ruse

and reacted with distrust or looked at *or then* ~~such statements~~ as

hopelessly naive and reacted with contempt by forgetting about

*about* serious bargaining and ~~attempting instead to exploit any~~



Page 6 *is intended*

*giving to Mrs Compulsion to exploit my*

counterpart who harbors such ~~obviously~~ pathetic illusions about the nature of the world struggle.

All of this is why, after a long experience of negotiating with the Soviets ~~out~~ Winston Churchill advised Western diplomats to never forget: "The Soviets... [have no understanding of such words as honesty, honor, trust and truth -- in fact, they regard these as negative virtues. They] will try every door in the home, enter all rooms which are not locked and when they come to a house that is barred, if they are unsuccessful in breaking through it, they will withdraw and invite you to dine genially that same evening."

*I met A*

*that of us is government must be candid*

But there is a second reason why ~~I have been candid about~~ *about the dangers we face abroad.*  
~~the Soviet Union, No policy and most of all no foreign policy~~

~~can be successfully conducted by a democratic government without the support of the people.~~ *you see,*

~~There are those who will caution that we must not openly discuss what the Soviets are up to because~~ *must not be discussed*

the people can't really comprehend the complex idea of having to negotiate with the Soviets at the same time recognizing their essential nature. Well, I think most of you know that I have never been much for the conventional wisdom here in the Capitol; in fact, I've always had the odd idea that not only can the people handle the truth but that they know more about it than ~~all~~ the seers and sayers along the Potomac.

*In fact,*

*dislocations*

One of the greatest ~~disturbances~~ that ever took place in our body politic occurred in the late '70's when our military power was permitted to fade, when there was so much talk here in Washington about how senseless some of our fears about communism

were. The American people knew this was wrong and were gravely disturbed; and that's why you have so strongly supported this

Administration in our defense buildup and <sup>our pursuit of a</sup> vigorous foreign ~~policy~~

~~stands like Grenada or our recent response to the Italian ship~~

*Such as our actions  
and the murder of American passengers.  
hijacking.*

Armed with common sense and unencumbered by capital  
chic, you the people have always understood that we live in a

~~dangerous world, that we must take seriously the reality of~~

Soviet power and the threat it poses to world freedom. <sup>You've</sup> I have

~~already quoted a few statesmen on this subject but maybe someone  
else who was considered the embodiment of the typical American~~

*Thought of*

~~put it best if somewhat less elaborately: it was Gary Cooper, who~~

~~said, "From what I hear about communism I don't like it because  
it isn't on the level."~~

So to those who say don't speak so openly because the

people won't understand; I say the people already understand and

can be trusted. <sup>And secretly else,</sup> ~~Something else,~~ even more important, needs to be

said here. If the day ever comes when the leaders of this Nation

remain silent in the face of foreign aggression <sup>or</sup> stop speaking out

about the repression of human rights <sup>the cause of freedom</sup> ~~then~~ the cause of

America <sup>has</sup> has been lost, and the great heart of this country ~~has~~ <sup>been</sup> ~~been~~  
broken.

~~Because once we stop speaking out for what is right it is  
not long before we stop standing up for what is right. So the  
real danger then in failing to face the world is to ourselves, to  
deny the most important part of ourselves.~~

~~Our belief in the rights of human beings to live out their  
own destiny free from the oppressive hand of government is what~~

~~her worth is the sight of God~~  
*of the people.*

*I would  
like that  
they must  
trust it.  
because  
we  
policy and  
especially in  
policy  
they  
can be  
carefully  
cent  
by a  
government  
written  
support*

*that they*

*1/11/71*

and is central to our way.

gave birth to this country. "Our whole experiment is based on the capacity of the people for self-government," said James Madison and "The mass of men were not born to wear saddles on their backs," said Thomas Jefferson. "This is our past, it is a part of us, we Americans have always stood for freedom, we pray that we always shall and we know our work as a Nation can never be completed until each man, woman and child knows the blessings of liberty."

person suffers sacrifice willingly.

and again "The God who gave us life, gave us liberty as well."

~~We cannot do it as passively; must not degenerate ever for a day,~~

as a people can never rest until

angels

And This is also why I go to Geneva. ~~To speak to stand~~ For freedom. For the right

~~for freedom of every people and every nation to choose their own future to choose their own destiny, their own fate.~~

So if nuclear war is an impossible option so too is the option of a world under totalitarian rule. ~~If we can neither~~

permit civilization to perish in a nuclear holocaust nor freedom to wither ~~in a quiet deadening accommodation with~~ under the steady and relentless assault of totalitarianism, how are we to steer around this terrible dilemma -- the very dilemma we will face next week in Geneva.

We can neither

~~How then are we to steer around this dilemma, what course are we to chart? I believe this can be done, indeed I believe there is great~~

My fellow Americans,

hope that the cause of peace and freedom will not only survive but triumph, and without war. ~~Indeed, that it may be the great paradox of our~~ <sup>and perhaps even sooner than any of us had ever dared to hope.</sup>

History may well record that the great paradox of our century that after giving birth to the twin menaces of nuclear weapons and totalitarians ~~not to mention so much bloodshed and~~ Saw so much bloodshed and heartache and gave birth

~~heartache, it may~~ was also the century that in its closing decades ~~it~~ also have fostered

the greatest flowering of mankind's age old quest for freedom and human dignity ~~and~~ The greatest movement in history towards free institutions and democratic self-rule, ~~the~~ Consider, for example, that at the start of this

century ~~for example,~~ there were only a handful of democracies in the world, today there are more than 50 and one-third of the

to live in the dignity that God intended for each of his children.

world's population is living under democratic rule. We can see the change here in our hemisphere, <sup>when</sup> today more than 90 percent of the people in Latin America are living under governments with democratic rule or governments headed in that direction; <sup>this is</sup> dramatic reversal from only a few years ago.

<sup>but</sup> The communist world is far from immune to this worldwide movement. In a sense Marx was right, the demand for economic well-being has brought the people into

conflict with the old political order; but he was wrong about predicting where this conflict would happen. Contrary to Marx's prediction, it is the democracies that are vibrant and growing -- bringing its people higher and higher standards of living even as freedom grows and <sup>deepens; while it is</sup> opens and the communist world where economies stagnate,

technology lags and the people are restless and unhappy with their lives. <sup>So,</sup> Even in the communist world, the great longing for personal freedom and democratic self-rule, the realization that economic progress is directly tied to the operation of a free market, surfaces again and again. In an astonishing turnaround from only a few years ago, China has adopted sweeping economic

reforms. And although for the moment Polish Solidarity has been suppressed this cannot last forever even as many Eastern European nations even now are seeking higher and higher standards of living for their people <sup>and so</sup>

In the Soviet Union too severe economic difficulties are leading to reappraisal and reexamination. <sup>Mr. Gorbachev himself has spoken to this issue.</sup> I do not wish to sound <sup>was beyond history</sup> overly optimistic but it is ~~not impossible~~ that the small elite

*that a small ruling elite -- if it meets resistance to foreign adventure --*  
~~that rules the Soviet Union would -- if we in the West continue to resist handing them the fruits of foreign adventure -- begin to ponder how to lend more legitimacy to <sup>it's</sup> their government by allowing their people more of voice in their own destiny.~~

~~Then what this would mean for the prospects of peace.~~  
*Think*  
~~Consider~~ what this would mean for the prospects of peace.

Consider what a process of democratization within the Soviet Union might contribute. Public involvement in the peace movement would grow as it has in the West *and* the enormous Soviet military budget ~~is~~ nearly 15 percent of the gross national product would suddenly be subjected to public scrutiny *it is here in the West. And* The problem of verification -- one of the central difficulties in negotiating arms control agreements -- could be dramatically eased. Above all, the suspicion and distrust which is endemic to closed political systems, and which so poisons <sup>the</sup> our ~~mutual~~ pursuit of peace, *of the Soviet Union and the United States* would be greatly alleviated.

(Dolan)  
November 2 1985  
7:00 p.m.

PRESIDENTIAL ADDRESS: TO THE NATION -- GENEVA SUMMIT

In 48 hours, I will be leaving for Geneva to meet with Mr. Gorbachev, the leader of the Soviet Union. Very few events attract as much attention as summit conferences and I felt it was my duty to report directly to you tonight on this meeting and its significance.

Now, I don't think it's any mystery why most of us regard summit conferences as a good idea. The danger of thermonuclear war and the havoc it would wreak is as President Kennedy put it, a modern sword of Damocles that dangles over the head of each of us. ~~But the awful reality of these weapons is really only~~ <sup>Actually, the awful reality of nuclear</sup> ~~is~~ <sup>only</sup> a kind of terrible crescendo to the steady, dehumanizing progress of modern warfare in this century. To a few people here in this office recently, I recalled a hotly debated issue in my own college years -- which by the way also took place in this century -- when some of us strenuously argued that in the advent of another <sup>world</sup> war no civilized person and certainly no American would obey an order to attack purely civilian targets. Humanity, we were certain, would never come to that. Well, World War II and 34 million civilian casualties later we were all sadly, tragically wiser. At least today we can say we have fewer illusions: we know a World War III will cause vast and devastating destruction with perhaps 90 percent civilian casualties.

*Believe me, the sphere of mass outrage leads to serious repletion on all this; whenever I travel, for example, I am followed by a similar kind who carries with him a small black attache case -- "the football" is its nickname. It is a grim reminder of the narrow line*

*Our world walks every day because it contains the codes necessary for retaliation to a nuclear attack on the United States.*

This office provides ~~another~~ <sup>an</sup> ~~even~~ <sup>more sobering and</sup> sadder perspective, one ~~you can be sure~~ I will be speaking about to Mr. Gorbachev in a few days. The 23 million lives lost since the end of World War II in conventional and regional conflicts are stark evidence that a strictly nuclear conflict is far from the only danger ~~our~~ <sup>we</sup>

~~world face.~~ <sup>Korea, Vietnam, other military engagements and</sup> <sup>all been part of this terrible</sup> ~~terrorist incidents have cost our own Nations~~ <sup>in recent years,</sup> ~~in recent years;~~ <sup>and many times</sup> ~~and many times~~ in this

<sup>at this desk</sup> Office I have had to fulfill the most difficult duty I have as President: to ~~try~~ and find words of comfort for grieving mothers and fathers. I don't have to tell you <sup>how regularly</sup> I failed; because there are no such words. It's one reason why when I visited <sup>earlier this year</sup> those places in Europe ~~earlier this year~~ that had seen so much suffering during World War II, I said a voice could be heard there, a voice from our century and from every century, the same voice I have heard so <sup>sorrowfully</sup> ~~often in sorrow~~ <sup>in this room,</sup> at this desk, the voice of humanity crying out in anguish but in hope; for peace and for an end to war.

*The Pursuit of Peace.*

This is why I go to Geneva. ~~The hope of peace.~~ The hope of never having to face that awful option of nuclear retaliation; the hope of never again having to speak from this office to grieved stricken loved ones, the hope that someday our Nation and the Soviet Union and all the people of the world will learn to heed the age-old cry of mankind for peace among all ~~the~~ <sup>of the Earth.</sup> nations.

There is another reason I go to Geneva. It has to do, like the threat of nuclear war, with a danger unique to our century.

As Americans we are aware of the danger of government that overreaches; in recent years we have <sup>to</sup> ~~struggled~~ together ~~successfully~~ to reverse years of mindless bureaucracy, burdensome regulation, stringent taxation and rampant inflation -- all of this combining to stifle personal freedom, economic growth and social excellence. Our Founding Fathers learned first-hand

history's most terrible but somehow most easily forgotten lesson: that the abuse of government power has brought economic ruin to many nations <sup>and</sup> that it ~~is~~ frequently <sup>leads to war</sup> ~~the cause of war~~ <sup>and they had a special appreciation for</sup> ~~and what it~~ has always posed the most serious and endjutrning threat to the freedom of man.

The twentieth century <sup>giving us havoc</sup> ~~however~~ has ~~seen~~ a quantum leap in this threat to freedom. <sup>coupled with the growth of modern</sup> ~~Ours, after all, is a century where~~ science and technology ~~and the rise of ideology~~ has seen the birth of the gravest threat to freedom we know -- the police state, the totalitarian society.

I do not think it is necessary to elaborate tonight on the human suffering and the loss of life totalitarian governments have caused in this century. Hitler's concentration camps or Stalin's purges, the Third Reich or the Gulag Archiapelog; <sup>upfront to</sup> ~~The~~ advent of totalitarian ideology -- an ideology which justifies any crime or ~~assault on~~ human rights done in the name of the state -- has sparked the worse assault in history on the human spirit.

My own views on all of this have been plainly stated in the past; I do not think they now need much elaboration. As recently as a few weeks ago, I spoke of some specific instances of Soviet

*the abuse of government power*

*the development of*

*and they had a special appreciation for*



01 29

conduct: the invasion of Afghanistan, an ~~act of aggression~~ <sup>an</sup> that has cost between 750,000 and one million lives not to mention nearly six million refugees, Soviet intervention in the African nations of Angola and Ethiopia, Soviet attempts to establish a totalitarian regime in Nicaragua and undermine democracy in this hemisphere, ~~as well as in Southeast Asia; and there are other matters I could have mentioned Soviet support and training for terrorists, the use of chemical biological weapons in Southeast Asia, the list goes on.~~

I think you know some well-meaning individuals have of course objected to candor on these points by myself and other members of the Administration; most of them do not deny the realities, <sup>but they do want to obscure it -- and</sup> but they regard any formal mention as both unnecessarily unpleasant and possibly upsetting to the diplomatic process.

I think this view is wrong and needs to be addressed. If history has shown there is any key to success with the Soviets in diplomatic negotiations, it is this: the Soviets must realize that their counterparts harbor no illusions about their ultimate goals or intentions and take them seriously. The Soviets honestly believe that they are in the vanguard of history; even if the democracies do nothing <sup>over</sup> ~~ever~~ against the Soviets -- ~~we are~~ <sup>the very fact we are here is</sup> still regarded as a threat, an obstacle to the march of history.

Indeed, our very existence is <sup>lauded</sup> ~~regarded~~ by the Soviets as an act of aggression against themselves, <sup>against history</sup> ~~Any~~ sudden shifts in our long held and realistic views on this point but especially any well-intentioned but naive statements minimizing the crucial

So I go to Geneva with no illusions, that one summit conference does not make for a permanent peace. Nor will it change the essential nature of the struggle now President Eisenhower put it.

We must understand how the Soviet mind works,

lauded against history against their ideals.

moral difference between totalitarianism and democracy runs the risk of seriously disrupting the negotiating process. That is because the Soviets will either regard such expressions as a ruse and react with distrust or should they believe them authentic, regard them as hopelessly naive and seek to exploit or take advantage of a counterpart who harbors such pathetic illusions.

Winston Churchill after a long history of negotiating with the Soviets put it very well when he advised Western leaders: "The Soviets have no understanding of such words as honesty, honor, trust and truth -- in fact, they regard these as negative virtues. They will try every door in the home, enter all rooms which are not locked and when they come to a house that is barred, if they are unsuccessful in breaking through it, they will withdraw and invite you to dine genially that same evening."

But there is a second reason why the candor I have practiced about the Soviet Union is important. The support of the people is necessary to the successful conduct of foreign policy in a democracy. There are some who say don't mention what the Soviets are really about because the people won't really understand the complex idea of having to both negotiate with the Soviets but yet recognize their essential nature. Well, the truth is such people make the mistake so many people in this city make: nobody knows better than the American people the essential nature of the Soviet Union. One of the great disturbances that ever took place in the body politics, one of the reasons this Administration has received such support for our defense buildup and vigorous foreign policy has been because the American people have a

profound and deep understanding -- the kind of understanding that comes from people who can't live in Washington and have common sense -- of the Soviet intentions and the threat they pose to our freedom. The American people understand, as President Eisenhower put it in his farewell address that, "we face a hostile ideology -- global in scope, atheistic in character, ruthless in purpose and insidious in method." Or as one friend of mine and a man who to millions was the quintessential quiet American, Gary Cooper put it, "From what I hear about communism I don't like it because it isn't on the level."

But it is not just because the American people are realistic about the Soviets that those of us in government must speak candidly about them. There is something even more important. I have noted before that once we stop making public the crucial moral distinctions about ourselves and the Soviets, once we stop speaking out for what is right it is not long before we stop standing up for what is right. The real danger then is to ourselves, to deny the most important part of ourselves. The American people believe with all their heart in what gave birth to this Nation, a respect for the rights of human beings to live out their own destiny -- our whole experiment is based on self government said James Madison -- the mass of men were not borne to wear saddles on their backs said Thomas Jefferson. This is a part of us we must not and cannot deny. We Americans have always stood for freedom, please God that we shall stand for freedom -- we hope and pray and our work as a Nation will never

*to  
remain  
silent  
I'm  
fear of  
Communism  
to stand  
my*

be fully complete until each man, women and child enjoys the rights of human dignity and personal freedom.

This then is also why I go to Geneva. <sup>Freedom.</sup> To speak for freedom;  
To stand for freedom.

(Dolan)  
November 21 1985  
5:00 p.m.

PRESIDENTIAL ADDRESS: TO THE NATION -- GENEVA SUMMIT

In 48 hours, I will be leaving for Geneva to meet with Mr. Gorbachev, the leader of the Soviet Union. Very few events attract as much attention as summit conferences and I felt it was my duty to report directly to you tonight on this meeting and its significance.

Now, I don't think it's any mystery why most of us regard summit conferences as a good idea. The danger of thermonuclear war <sup>for</sup> and the havoc it would wreak is, as President Kennedy put it, a modern sword of Damocles dangling over the head of each of us. ~~Actually,~~ the awful reality of these weapons is <sup>actually</sup> really only a kind of terrible crescendo to the steady, dehumanizing progress of modern warfare itself in this century. To a few people here in this office recently, I recalled a hotly debated issue in my own college years -- which by the way also took place in this century -- when some of us strenuously argued that in the advent of another world war no civilized person and certainly no American would <sup>ever</sup> obey an order to attack purely civilian targets. Humanity, we were certain, would never come to that. Well, World War II and 34 million civilian casualties later we were all sadly, tragically wiser. At least today we can say we have fewer illusions: we know <sup>h</sup> a World War III <sup>break out the destruction will be</sup> will ~~cause~~ vast and devastating ~~destruction~~ with perhaps 90 percent civilian casualties.

Believe me, the office I now occupy leads to serious reflection on all this. Whenever I travel, for example, I am followed by a military aide who carries with him a small black attache case -- "the football" is its nickname. It is a grim reminder of the narrow line our world walks every day because it contains the codes necessary for retaliation to a nuclear attack on the United States.

And this office provides another sobering, even sadder perspective on our world, one I will talk about to Mr. Gorbachev *in* <sup>how deep but must</sup> ~~shortly and not~~ to mention to you now. The 23 million lives lost since the end of World War II in conventional and regional conflicts are stark evidence that a strictly nuclear conflict is far from the only danger we face. In recent years, America has had her share of fallen sons; Korea, Vietnam, other military engagements including terrorist attacks have been part of this terrible cost. And many times at this desk I have had to discharge the most difficult duty I have as President: to find the words of comfort for grieving mothers and fathers. I don't have to tell you how regularly I fail <sup>at that; that's</sup> because there are no such words. <sup>Ad</sup> It's one reason why earlier this year when I visited those places in Europe that had seen so much suffering during World War II, I said a voice could be heard there, a voice from our century and from every century, the same voice I have heard in such sorrow here in this room, the voice of humanity crying out in anguish but in hope for peace -- and for the end to war.

This is why I go to Geneva. For peace. And in hope. The hope of never having to face that awful option of nuclear

retaliation; the hope of never again having to speak from this office to grief-stricken loved ones, the hope that someday our Nation and the Soviet Union and all the people of the world will learn to heed the age-old cry of mankind for peace among all nations.

There is another reason I go to Geneva. It has to do, like the threat of nuclear war, with a danger unique to <sup>this</sup> our century.

*Part of our heritage is*

As Americans <sup>in our country</sup> we are aware of the danger of government that overreaches, <sup>and</sup> how mindless bureaucracy, burdensome regulation, stringent taxation and rampant inflation <sup>that</sup> can stifle personal freedom, economic growth and social excellence. Few knew better than our Founding Fathers that excessive government had brought many nations to economic ruin and led to foreign adventure and war. <sup>So,</sup> they left us their special appreciation for history's most terrible but, somehow, most easily forgotten lesson: that the abuse of government power has always posed the most serious and enduring threat to the freedom of man.

<sup>And</sup> the twentieth century, with the development of science and technology and the rise of modern ideology, <sup>we have seen</sup> has given us a quantum leap in the <sup>nature</sup> size of that <sup>this</sup> threat to <sup>danger</sup> freedom, ~~in our time~~ <sup>and</sup> we have seen the birth of the gravest threat to freedom ever known -- the police state, the totalitarian society.

<sup>Now</sup> I don't think I have to elaborate <sup>today</sup> on the human suffering and the loss of life totalitarian governments <sup>have</sup> ~~have~~ <sup>had</sup> caused in this century. Hitler's concentration camps or Stalin's purges, the Third Reich or the Gulag Archipaelog, the advent of totalitarian ideology -- an ideology which justifies any crime or

affront to the individual done in the name of the state -- has sparked the worse assault in history on the human spirit.

On this point, my own views have been plainly stated in the past; I do not think they now need much elaboration. Only as recently as a few weeks ago, I spoke of some specific instances of Soviet conduct: the invasion of Afghanistan, one that has cost between 750,000 and one million lives not to mention nearly six million refugees, Soviet intervention in the African nations of Angola and Ethiopia, Soviet attempts to establish a totalitarian regime in Nicaragua and undermine democracy in this hemisphere; the list goes on.

~~I mention this here, however, because I think most of you~~

~~know that some well-meaning individuals have objected in the past to candor about communism by myself and other members of the Administration.~~

~~Most of these people don't deny the reality of what we say but they sincerely believe this reality is best left in obscurity where it is less unpleasant and less likely to disrupt the diplomatic process.~~

~~Now, I have always thought this view wrong; let me explain why.~~

If history has shown there is any key to dealing successfully with the Soviets it is this: the Soviets must realize that we take them seriously above all, that we harbor no illusions about ultimate Soviet goals and intentions. The Soviet mind is not the mirror image of the American or the Western mind, it is both wrong and arrogant to assume that it is. Because the Soviets believe that the march of history is embodied in Soviet power, and that the mere existence of the democracies is seen by them as

*of such*

~~do not elaborate, I think you should~~  
~~at all this,~~

*I mention this, however, because I think you know this*

*surely don't deny the reality of*

*although they are at least*

*such topics are best left alone*

*but with the Geneva meet and a*

*then they say it is especially important to explain why...*

*counterparts*

*and that*

*they*

*and*

*seeing*

*so to them*



So, you see, the Soviets have a very different view of the world than we do; they believe ~~that~~ a great struggle is already underway in the world and peace can only be attained when Communism triumphs. So too, they have a very different definition of aggression than we do. From their perspective,

have  
not  
different  
the world  
means  
the  
the  
the

an obstacle to the ultimate triumph of the Soviet state. ~~So even if the democracies~~ <sup>Even if the ~~democracies~~</sup> ~~if we do nothing overt against the Soviets, our survival, our mere existence, is considered by them as an act of aggression against themselves, against their ideology and against history.~~ <sup>the predetermined course of</sup>

links and  
you see

That is why any sudden shifts by the West in ~~our~~ <sup>in our</sup> realistic and long-held views about the Soviets especially any ~~well-intentioned~~ <sup>we make</sup> naive public statements minimizing the crucial moral distinction between totalitarianism and democracy, ~~tends to seriously disrupt the negotiating process.~~ <sup>leads to disrupt the negotiating process.</sup> In the past, when such statements have been made, the Soviets have either regarded them as a ruse and reacted with distrust or looked on them <sup>such statements</sup> as hopelessly naive and reacted by forgetting about serious negotiating and giving in <sup>to their</sup> instead to their compulsion to exploit <sup>them and</sup> any counterpart who harbors such pathetic illusions about the nature of the world struggle.

and why the Soviets misinterpret

All of this is why, after a long experience of negotiating with the Soviets, Winston Churchill advised Western diplomats to never forget: "The Soviets... [have no understanding of such words as honesty, honor, trust and truth -- in fact, they regard these as negative virtues. They] will try every door in the home, enter all rooms which are not locked and when they come to a house that is barred, if they are unsuccessful in breaking through it, they will withdraw and invite you to dine genially that same evening."

And I urge you <sup>wanted to be blunt with you tonight; I</sup> not to have President to remind you not to have any either. One summit conference does not make for a permanent peace, not even ~~to make~~

et alone permanent peace; itself.)

not even

permanent process for peace, Nor does <sup>the fact of a summit conference</sup> ~~this~~ mean the essential <sup>the fact of a summit conference</sup> ~~nature~~ of the struggle now going on in the world has been changed, or that ~~the Soviets have altered~~ <sup>and that they have forsaken</sup> their long-term goals and objectives. <sup>Let us</sup> ~~We must~~ never forget, as President Eisenhower put it in his farewell address to the American people, ~~that~~ "we face a hostile ideology -- global in scope, atheistic in character, ruthless in purpose and insidious in method."

<sup>But</sup> there is a second reason why those of us in government must be candid about the dangers we face abroad. <sup>and again it is 4</sup> ~~You see, there~~ are those who will caution that ~~the Soviets are up to~~ <sup>say we must not speak of anything about the Soviet</sup> must not be discussed because you the people ~~can't really comprehend~~ <sup>aren't capable of handling</sup> the

<sup>paradox</sup> complex idea of having to negotiate with the Soviets <sup>even as we</sup> ~~at the same~~ time ~~recognizing their essential nature.~~ <sup>disapprove of their government and its actions.</sup> Well, I think most of you know that I have never been much for the conventional wisdom here in the Capitol; in fact, <sup>and you know, I've also</sup> I've always had the odd idea that not only can the people handle the truth <sup>but that</sup> they know more about it than the seers and sayers along the Potomac. <sup>in fact A</sup>

<sup>That's why</sup> In fact, one of the greatest dislocations that ever took place in our body politic occurred in the late 70's when <sup>one line in</sup> ~~our~~ <sup>Washington pentagon</sup> military power was ~~permitted to fade,~~ <sup>decided</sup> when there was so much talk <sup>and</sup> here in Washington about <sup>suggest that</sup> how senseless some of our fears about communism were. <sup>were blown,</sup> The American people knew this was wrong and <sup>they knew</sup> ~~were~~ gravely disturbed <sup>the Soviets would take advantage of such naivete.</sup> and that's why you have so strongly supported this Administration in our defense buildup and our pursuit of a vigorous foreign, such as our actions in Grenada or our recent response to the hijacking of an Italian ship and the murder of an American passenger. Armed with common sense and unencumbered by

I do not mention all this to sound unduly pessimistic or discouraged to paint a headline, discouraging picture. I do not mention all this to the contrary, if this truly represents reality, it is only by leaving our illusions behind and dealing realistically with the situation that we have any chance of making progress at all in Germany. They understand it all in Germany. They understand it all from the German side's Comm. perspective. It can be sure, it is only the Soviets who have any chance of making progress at all in Germany. I assure you that it's what they want from the German side's Comm. perspective.

in fact A

*never had illusion about the Soviet system; as an friend of mine, Gary Cooper, put it in his classically American way!*

capital chic, you the people have ~~always understood that we must~~ take seriously the reality of Soviet power and the threat it poses to world freedom. You've never had illusions on this point others have had. As a friend of mine and the man often thought of as the typical American, Gary Cooper put it: "From what I hear about communism I don't like it because it isn't on the level."

*And you have always*

So to those who say don't speak so openly because the people won't understand; I say the people already understand and that they can be trusted. ~~Indeed that they must be trusted; because~~ No policy and especially no foreign policy can be

*insert A*

successfully carried out by a democratic government without the support of the people. *So to those who say don't frighten the people can't understand; I respond: trust the people the people already understand.*

And something else, even more important, needs to be said here. If the day ever comes when the leaders of this Nation remain silent in the face of foreign aggression or stop speaking out about the repression of human rights then truly the cause of America, the cause of freedom has been lost, and the great heart of this country has been broken.

*insert B*

Our belief in the dignity of the individual and in his or her worth in the sight of God gave birth to this country, and is central to our being. "Our whole experiment is based on the capacity of the people for self-government," said James Madison; and Thomas Jefferson said ~~it~~ more directly: "The mass of men were not born to wear saddles on their backs," and again "The God who gave us life, gave us liberty as well." This is our past, it is a part of us, we must ~~not~~ <sup>never</sup> deny nor ~~ever~~ <sup>it</sup> forsake, we Americans

*And something else never more essential needs to be said here.*

*insert B*

*As we will never view*

have always stood for freedom and we know as a people ~~can never rest and our work as a Nation can never be complete~~ <sup>complete, we can never rest as a people</sup> until each man, woman and child on earth knows the blessings of liberty.

And this is the second reason I go to Geneva. For freedom <sup>F</sup> for the right of every people and every nation to choose their future, ~~to live in the dignity God intended for each of his children.~~ <sup>the right of every person to determine his or her own destiny and to</sup> Here then we can see the Geneva dilemma, the dilemma

of our times. We can neither permit civilization to perish in a nuclear holocaust nor freedom to wither under the steady and relentless assault of totalitarianism. <sup>But if</sup> Nuclear war is an

impossible option <sup>and</sup> but so too is a world under totalitarian rule, <sup>how</sup> ~~how then are we to steer around this~~ <sup>between them, how then are</sup>

My fellow Americans, how then are we to steer <sup>around this</sup> ~~dilemma, what course are we to chart?~~ <sup>to confront this dilemma at Geneva, the dilemma of our times, what course are we to chart?</sup> I believe there is great

cause for hope -- <sup>hope that the cause of peace and freedom will</sup> not only survive but triumph, <sup>and</sup> perhaps even sooner than any of us

had ever dared to hope. <sup>a few years ago, i'm sure</sup> ~~History may well record that the great~~ <sup>in that it is possible that</sup> paradox of our <sup>time: that the</sup> century, a century that saw so much bloodshed and

heartache and gave birth to the <sup>unbridled</sup> twin menaces of nuclear weapons and totalitarianism, <sup>government</sup> was also the century that in its closing <sup>fostered</sup> decades fostered

<sup>aspiration</sup> the greatest flowering of mankind's age old <sup>quest for freedom and human dignity</sup> and the greatest movement in history towards free institutions and democratic self-rule,

Consider, for example, that at the start of this century <sup>while</sup> there were only a handful of democracies in the entire world, <sup>today</sup> there are more than 50 <sup>with</sup> and one-third of the world's population is living under democratic rule.

We can see the change <sup>there</sup> here in our hemisphere <sup>where</sup> ~~where~~ more than 90 percent of the people in Latin

*Our goals for both peace and freedom we need*

*how then are we to chart our course in this time?*

now  
America are living under governments with democratic rule or governments headed in that direction; ~~this is~~ dramatic reversal from only a few years ago.

Even  
And the communist world is far from immune to this worldwide movement. ~~That's because~~ In a sense Marx was right, the demand for economic well-being has brought ~~the~~ <sup>the working masses</sup> people into

only  
conflict with the old political order; ~~but~~ he was wrong about predicting where this conflict would ~~happen~~ <sup>own</sup>. Contrary to Marx's prediction, it is the democracies that are vibrant and growing -- bringing ~~its~~ <sup>to their</sup> people higher and higher standards of living even as freedom grows and deepens ~~while~~ while it is the communist world where economies stagnate, technology lags and the people are restless and unhappy with their lives. So ~~we~~ <sup>we seem see</sup> even in the communist world, the great longing for personal freedom and democratic self-rule, the realization that economic progress is directly tied to the operation of a free market, surfacing again and again. In an astonishing turnaround from only a few years ago, ~~China~~ <sup>for example</sup> has adopted sweeping economic reforms. ~~Even as~~ <sup>And</sup> many Eastern European nations even now are seeking higher and higher standards of living for their people and although for the moment Polish Solidarity has been suppressed, ~~this cannot last forever.~~ <sup>we know the spirit of the Polish people is with her freedom and God that they will be freed from again.</sup>

In the Soviet Union too, severe economic difficulties are leading to reappraisal and reexamination. Mr. Gorbachev himself has spoken to this issue ~~I do not wish to sound overly optimistic but it was~~ <sup>and I intend to engage him rather than this matter when we meet</sup> before in history: ~~that~~ <sup>we should recognize that it has happened</sup> a small ruling elite -- if it meets resistance to foreign adventure -- begins to

W. must be very

ponder how to lend more legitimacy to its government by allowing their people more of voice in their own destiny.

*And* Think what this would mean for the prospects of peace *arm control and peace,*

Consider what a process of democratization within the Soviet Union might contribute. Public involvement in the peace movement would grow as it has in the West and the enormous Soviet military budget nearly 15 percent of the gross national product would suddenly be subjected to public scrutiny as it is here in the West. And the problem of verification -- one of the central difficulties in negotiating arms control agreements -- could be dramatically eased. Above all, the suspicion and distrust which is endemic to closed political systems, and which so poisons the pursuit of peace, *by* the Soviet Union and the United States, would be greatly alleviated.

course -- one that begins to lend legitimacy to their government by allowing its people a voice in their own destiny.

Consider what this would mean for the prospects of peace. Consider what a process of democratization within the Soviet Union might contribute. Public involvement in the peace movement would grow as it has in the West -- the enormous Soviet military budget -- nearly 15 percent of the gross national product would suddenly be subjected to public scrutiny. The problem of verification -- one of the central difficulties in negotiating arms control agreements -- could be dramatically eased. ~~We could, in fact, introduce an "open land" policy to complete the tacit "open skies" policy. This would permit much more thorough verification and possibly lead to the abolition of whole categories of arms such as chemical weapons. Above all, the suspicion and distrust which is endemic to closed political systems, and which so poisons the pursuit of peace, would be greatly alleviated.~~

*insert A*

*our mutual*

Yet even if this process does not take place soon -- I believe the renewed strength of the democratic movement complimented by a global campaign for freedom would strengthen the prospects for arms control.

Such a campaign would make clear that we in the West do not intend to continue the mistakes of prior generations and other governments who failed to take seriously the stated intention of their adversaries, who engaged in the self-delusions that in 1938 led to the invasion of Poland or in 1980 the invasion of Afghanistan.

because the development of science and technology ; could be  
with the force of modern ideology have caused a quantum leap in  
this danger by giving birth to the police state, the  
totalitarian society.

our goals must be limited if we attempt to resolve all  
our differences we'd be in Geneva to see Halley's comet the  
next time around

I appreciate your suggestion for the conference from the  
profound ones on defensive research the less profound ones that I  
bring to Geneva stroganoff flavored jelly beans.

I have been happy to see the Russians so forthright in  
stating views, I and I'm delighted to see they believe as firmly  
as we do in the value of America's free press.

There's something else in common besides the fact we both eat  
the same wheat.

I expect the meeting will be difficult very few worthwhile  
things are simple and easy apart from this administration tax  
play.

I'm glad they don't do well in the first debate;  
different systems when someone says the leader is wrong  
and the consequences are calculated grave ; here we call it a press  
conference.

change from opposition rebuttal and refusal -- he's  
never dealt with the Congress.

Mr. Rogachev a charming man, I'm sure I'll like even  
though I disagree with his policies the same sort of white way  
O'Neill looks at me.