

Ronald Reagan Presidential Library
Digital Library Collections

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

Collection: Raymond, Walter: Files
Folder Title: US-Soviet Public Diplomacy
(04/16/1984-06/25/1984)
Box: RAC Box 7

To see more digitized collections visit:

<https://www.reaganlibrary.gov/archives/digitized-textual-material>

To see all Ronald Reagan Presidential Library inventories visit:

<https://www.reaganlibrary.gov/archives/white-house-inventories>

Contact a reference archivist at: reagan.library@nara.gov

Citation Guidelines: <https://reaganlibrary.gov/archives/research-support/citation-guide>

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

WITHDRAWAL SHEET

Ronald Reagan Library

Collection Name RAYMOND, WALTER: FILES

Withdrawer

KML 2/27/2012

File Folder U.S.-SOVIET PUBLIC DIPLOMACY (04/16/1984-06/25/1984)

FOIA

M10-326/2

Box Number 11

PARRY

59

ID	Doc Type	Document Description	No of Pages	Doc Date	Restrictions
132371	LETTER	GIFF MALONE TO JACK RE SPEECH	1	4/16/1984	B1
132372	MEMO	GIFFORD MALONE TO GERALD HELMAN RE PROPOSED EASTER SPEECH	2	4/16/1984	B1
132373	MEMO	JAMES JATRAS TO WALTER RAYMOND RE PRESIDENTIAL SPEECH	2	4/19/1984	B1
132374	MEMO	TO WALTER RAYMOND RE PRESIDENTIAL SPEECH	4	4/12/1984	B1
134374	NOTE	FROM WALTER RAYMOND RE BOOK CLUB	1	5/24/1984	B3
132375	MEMO	JACK MATLOCK TO ROBERT MCFARLANE RE PRESIDENTIAL STATEMENT	1	6/25/1984	B1
		R 6/8/2018 M326/2			

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

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

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

WITHDRAWAL SHEET

Ronald Reagan Library

Collection Name

Raymond, Walter: Files

Withdrawer

KM 2/27/2012
L

File Folder

U.S.-SOVIET PUBLIC DIPLOMACY (04/16/1984-06/25/1984)

FOIA

M10-326/2
PARRY

Box Number

11

59

<i>ID</i>	<i>Document Type</i> <i>Document Description</i>	<i>No of</i> <i>pages</i>	<i>Doc Date</i>	<i>Restric-</i> <i>tions</i>
132371	LETTER GIFF MALONE TO JACK RE SPEECH	1	4/16/1984	B1

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

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

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

WITHDRAWAL SHEET

Ronald Reagan Library

Collection Name
Raymond, Walter: Files

Withdrawer
KM 2/27/2012
L

File Folder
U.S.-SOVIET PUBLIC DIPLOMACY (04/16/1984-06/25/1984)

FOIA
M10-326/2
PARRY

Box Number
11

59

<i>ID</i>	<i>Document Type</i> <i>Document Description</i>	<i>No of</i> <i>pages</i>	<i>Doc Date</i>	<i>Restric-</i> <i>tions</i>
132372	MEMO GIFFORD MALONE TO GERALD HELMAN RE PROPOSED EASTER SPEECH	2	4/16/1984	B1

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

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

WITHDRAWAL SHEET

Ronald Reagan Library

Collection Name
Raymond, Walter: Files

Withdrawer
KM 2/27/2012
L

File Folder
U.S.-SOVIET PUBLIC DIPLOMACY (04/16/1984-06/25/1984)

FOIA
M10-326/2
PARRY

Box Number
11

59

<i>ID</i>	<i>Document Type</i> <i>Document Description</i>	<i>No of</i> <i>pages</i>	<i>Doc Date</i>	<i>Restric-</i> <i>tions</i>
132373	MEMO JAMES JATRAS TO WALTER RAYMOND RE PRESIDENTIAL SPEECH	2	4/19/1984	B1

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

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

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

My Dear Friends.

During this joyous paschal season, I would like to convey my sincere best wishes to you, the peoples of Russia and of the other lands which form the USSR, and to speak to you on the present place in the world of our countries and our common prospects for the future. My remarks are addressed directly to you, the people, for I believe that the edifice of peace must rest firmly on a foundation of genuine friendship and understanding between peoples and not simply on an improvement in relations between governments. This point is of particular importance with regard to you, who live under a system dedicated to principles completely different from our own, a system which has tried to deprive you of any genuine contact with and understanding of other nations. Such understanding is of critical importance today, and so I must be completely frank and honest with you. My words to you, which I hope will reach you by every possible means, are based on the contention that the truth, however unpleasant, must be faced squarely. The perilous state of today's world will not improve with anything less than both our countries' honestly shouldering our responsibilities and, I hope, achieving a genuine and lasting friendship. For it is no exaggeration to say that we, the peoples of Russia and America, today control between us the destiny of the entire human race.

In the turmoil that characterizes today's world it is often overlooked that our two lands -- so alike in their breadth and variety -- have often experienced warm and friendly relations. For example, during the American Civil War of the 1860's Russia was the only one of the great European powers to openly side with the cause of Union and Liberty and even dispatched naval squadrons to New York and San Francisco as a show of support. And the second decade of the present turbulent century saw our countries firmly linked as allies in the tragic fratricidal conflict which shook Western Civilization to its roots and which sounded the strident theme of war, revolution, and destruction which has plagued the international community ever since.

My friends, you are the last people in the world who have to be told that for you, starting from World War I, this has been a catastrophic century. Even excluding the terrible toll of the Second World War -- when, again, we fought as allies, and when too, I think, our peoples experienced a very real sense of friendship -- your country has suffered famine, internal strife, and repression unimaginable in most other countries. Though promised, land, peace, and bread have been scarce commodities for most of you during these past six decades. My purpose today is not to recount the dismal history of the various purges, terrors, and campaigns against

non-existent "enemies of the people" or to chronicle the damage to your religious and national values and your cultural integrity. Even so, how can one not be particularly appalled by such atrocities as the destruction in 1931 of that gem of Russian architecture, the Cathedral of Christ the Savior in Moscow; or the sheer sacrilege of turning the Cathedral of St. Casimir in Vilnius into a museum of atheism? Such actions, more than any words, vividly demonstrate communism's true and vicious nature.

But for good or ill, the past cannot be undone. The question before us now is how to go forward. For you, how to achieve a better and freer life. For us, how to preserve and improve what we have. And for both of us, how we may together provide for a happier and more peaceful world and make a genuine contribution to the common welfare of the human race.

However, for us to do this, freedom must be won, cherished, defended. However much we might wish otherwise, my friends, the nations of the world which still have their freedom, including the United States, must take steps to defend themselves from the desire of your leaders to see us under the same system as yours, a matter of "historical inevitability," as they say. This we will not accept. And so we are forced to defend ourselves, and, unfortunately, that means building weapons. We

wish for no misunderstanding about this, but what you have been told about our policies is, to put it charitably, inaccurate. You have heard, no doubt, that the USA is preparing for war with all sorts of horrible-sounding weapons: Pershings, cruise missiles, the MX, chemical weapons, and so on. Having no shame, they even trot the Patriarch of Moscow out to bear witness to these falsehoods.

This is done because the facts are quite a bit different from what you are led to believe, as a brief recitation of the particulars will illustrate. For instance, consider the situation with chemical weapons -- a distasteful topic, to be sure. But you must understand that in the early 1970's our leaders, believing the promises of the Soviets about "detente" and "relaxation of tension" destroyed chemical stockpiles and all but halted research in this area. But your leaders not only continued to build such weapons but today use them -- in Afghanistan and in Southeast Asia, where many thousands of defenseless villagers have been killed by them. In light of this we, however reluctantly, once again have to consider the production of chemical weapons, though we would prefer to abolish them completely and have proposed an international agreement to this effect.

And consider the question of our Pershings and cruise missiles, which the NATO alliance has begun putting into Europe. Before the end of the 1970's, although the Soviet Union had always possessed a great advantage in conventional weapons -- tanks, artillery, personnel carriers -- there had been a rough equivalence in nuclear weaponry. That balance was disrupted by your leaders when, at the rate of one per week, they began to deploy a new type of extremely destructive missile -- the SS-20 -- which could hit the capitals of our allies in a matter of minutes. So we made plans to compensate in part by deploying Pershing and cruise missiles. But contrary to what you may believe, these missiles can in no way be regarded as "first strike" weapons. However, we offered to remove the threat to both sides: if the Soviets would get rid of their missiles, we would not deploy any missiles of our own. But this they rejected, calling it "unilateral disarmament" for the USSR. So last March we tried again, saying, alright, we will deploy only some of our missiles, and the Soviets will get rid of some of theirs, so that the resulting numbers would be equal. Again, they rejected our proposal. Clearly the only solution that the Soviets desire is that they have their rockets and we have none, giving them nuclear superiority to match their superiority in conventional weapons. In effect, they want us to concede that we will not defend our allies in Europe. And when the Soviet

representatives saw that we were unwilling to concede this, they walked out of not only these negotiations but others as well. We very much regret this, as we believe that even the deepest of differences are no reason not to keep talking.

But let us look at the big picture. With regard to nuclear weapons, the simple truth is, America's total nuclear stockpile has declined. Today, we have far fewer nuclear weapons than we had 30 years ago. And in terms of its total destructive power, our nuclear stockpile is at the lowest level in 25 years.

For example, just a few months ago, we and our allies agreed to withdraw 1,400 nuclear weapons from Western Europe. This comes after the withdrawal of 1,000 nuclear weapons from Europe 3 years ago. Even if all our planned intermediate-range missiles have to be deployed in Europe over the next 5 years -- and we hope this will not be necessary -- we will have eliminated five existing nuclear weapons for each new weapon deployed.

Meanwhile, over the past twenty years, our defense expenditures have fallen as a portion both of the US Government's spending and of our country's total economic production. To give another example, in 1955 the US government

spent only one-fifth of its money on payments to individual citizens and more than half of its money on defense. Today, out of a much larger budget, we spend about half on individuals and about one-quarter on defense. By 1980, our defense expenditure was only four-fifths of what it was in 1970.

But what of the Soviet Union? Where does your country's wealth go? A tremendous amount -- up to 40% of the USSR's production, according to some sources in Russia -- goes to military uses and weapons of war.

This is not just a problem with weapons. You have no doubt heard a great deal about US "aggression" against Grenada. But our forces have been withdrawn. Our goal, besides protecting our own citizens there, was to restore genuine self-government to the people of that small island, which the USSR, Castro, and communists from various countries were turning into a base for aggression against the all-but-defenseless islands of the Eastern Caribbean and a transshipment point for arms to other points in this hemisphere. We quickly achieved our purpose -- the first time, as it happens, the "irreversible" establishment of communism anywhere has been reversed -- and quickly got our soldiers and marines out. But the people of Grenada, 91% of them according to one poll, overwhelmingly approved our

restoration of their freedom. They put up signs saying "God Bless America." You would not know it from what you hear in your news media, but the name "America" is a beacon of freedom looked to by all the world; the only problem we have on our borders is how to control the vast flood of people constantly flocking to us in search of a better life.

How different all this is from the ongoing war in Afghanistan. The blood of your sons and brothers is squandered in the mountains and ravines of that unhappy land not for the defense of your own homeland or people but merely to keep a "fraternal socialist" regime from falling. Contrary to what you have heard, it is Soviet, not Afghan, troops that carry the brunt of the fighting and sustain the greatest casualties. Contrary to what you have heard, there are no American troops there at all, and the Afghan fighters are not "bandits" but just ordinary Afghan peasants who want to preserve their own way of life. Sometimes, soldiers from the Soviet army are so sickened by the way the war is conducted there -- using horrible weapons against innocent civilians -- that they go over to the anti-communist side. Perhaps the saddest aspect of this war for you is that the outrages committed, whatever the nationality of the perpetrators, are attributed to Russia, to you, and blacken your name and reputation in the eyes of other

peoples. "Russia" has come to have a negative association in the mind of the world, and of course you know that nobody dies trying to get into the USSR -- only trying to get out.

But notwithstanding the deliberate misrepresentation of our policies we stand ready, despite the differences which separate us from your leaders, to do whatever might be possible to improve relations and to reduce the risk of an outbreak of hostilities. But remember, it was not we who broke off the arms control talks: it was the Soviets leaders. Our representatives are still at the table, so to speak, waiting. We remain ready to negotiate in good faith meaningful, verifiable reductions in the level of armaments. We are prepared to meet the Soviets half-way on such reductions, no matter how long it takes or how difficult it may be. On January 16 of this year I challenged the Soviets to respond positively, to meet us half-way, to work constructively with us for a new start for a more peaceful world. We are still waiting for a friendly and positive response. We still hope -- and we will never give up hoping -- that your leaders will turn from their unattainable quest for "the triumph of socialism on a world scale" to the welfare of the people placed by God under their care.

And one other point. Deliberate attempts have been made to give you the impression that our policies are directed not against communism's aggressiveness but against you, the peoples of Russia, specifically the Russian people. Those who create these impressions even suggest that I and other officials have condemned in my speeches "the Russians" or even "the Russians barbarians" or "the perfidious Russians." They suggest that my Administration is whipping up hatred and a "war hysteria" against you. This is a blatant misrepresentation. Nothing could be farther from the truth. I have never condemned the Russian people or any other nation that shares this planet with us. Our difficulties are with the policies of the Soviet leaders. We are well aware of the difference between unelected governments and the helpless nations over which they rule. Let me be as clear as possible: we have no quarrel with the Russian people or with any other people living under Soviet rule. As I said on January 16:

"...people don't make wars. People want to raise their children in a world without fear and without war. They want to have some of the good things over and above bare subsistence that make life worth living. They want to work at some craft, trade, or profession that gives them satisfaction and a sense of worth. Their common interests cross all borders."

This I strongly believe: Russians and Americans are naturally friends, not enemies. To all of the peoples of your country we extend our hand in friendship and in peace.

Now I understand that you may not be inclined to believe that what I have told you is true. You may not believe that the things you read or see on television about our country and world affairs are designed to deceive you. But, please, consider this: you know the reality of things as they are in your own country, things which you can verify with your own eyes; and you know just how truthful your leaders and your news media are when they talk about this same reality. So I ask you: why should they be more truthful in describing the outside world and the international situation, which you are not permitted to see and verify with your own eyes, than they are when they distort what goes on in your own country, the truth of which you can see? And for that matter, why shouldn't you be free to travel abroad and make your own judgements and express them freely, as our people do?

Here, in our country, all questions of weapons and military affairs; of peace and war, of foreign policy are open, not secret as in the USSR. Our policies are not set in concrete by any party or ideology. The natural inclination of a free

country is to spend money on food, clothing, travel, amusement, just about anything but weapons of war. This is so because our free enterprise economy is the result of millions of economic decision-makers demanding and supplying products in the marketplace and is not run by a central plan controlled by a few powerful men who can use this centralized mechanism to place the highest priority on military production. Because our system is decentralized, we disagree here on how much to spend on defense. Since we barely built anything of military significance during the last decade, while the Soviets moved first to parity with us and then beyond, I believe that we need to build more. But many other people -- among them many elected representatives in Congress, which unlike the Supreme Soviet is not a sham parliament but a real one -- think we should spend less. And I can't just order people around in these matters; I have to go on television and talk to the people and try to convince them. But in your country, these matters are all secret. All of the things I have just told you, your leaders already know very well, yet they deliberately keep you in the dark about where your country's resources go. Of course everybody has some idea: part of it to revolutionaries around the world who care nothing about the well-being of Russia; and a large part goes to maintaining the top communists in the kind of luxury that would put any nobleman of times past or any Western millionaire to shame.

Meanwhile, most of you live in a poverty that nobody in 1913 would have believed could possibly exist in Russia seven decades later. Who then would have believed that Russia, once the world's largest grain exporter, would someday be a hungry country, the world's largest importer of foodstuffs? But in our free economy, where personal initiative is rewarded, we are able to produce far more grain than we know what to do with; we have to pay farmers not to grow too much. However, if it weren't for the foreign, including American, grain which your country now imports, many of you would be without bread. You eat our grain, our bread, we feed you -- yet you are told that we are out to kill you.

But, again your leaders know all this, and they even get into the domestic debate here. It seems that every other news show on our media features a Soviet spokesman explaining why the US should reduce its defenses. Not in America, nor anywhere else in the world is anyone deprived of the Soviet viewpoint; we get it directly from Soviet publications and from the mouths of Soviet officials. But you, how do you hear about us? Why, from the very same Soviet officials. When was the last time you heard an American official discuss our policies on the radio or saw one of our spokesmen on television? Why should we not have a fair, open exchange of ideas uncontrolled

by party or government? But no, instead, the Soviets tell you what they say our policy is, that we are openly calling for war and so forth, even though neither I nor any other American official has ever called for war of any sort. They note that the Soviets have called for a mutual pledge never to be the first to use nuclear weapons, but we have refused. Why? Because we say that no weapons or force of any sort, nuclear or non-nuclear, should be used. And the sad fact is that the Soviets have been less than honest in keeping the agreements they have signed.

The Soviet slogans -- "peace" and "peaceful coexistence" -- hide the fact that they are giving us here a simple choice. We can have so-called peace as long as we are willing to surrender, year by year, country by country. For even under conditions of "peaceful coexistence" the "international class struggle" and "the ideological struggle" against us continue; and if we try to tell our side of the story, they call it "psychological warfare."

We are determined to defend our lives and our liberty, but we are a fundamentally decent people, a God-fearing nation. It pains us that our defense must be guaranteed by terrible weapons which if used would rain death down upon not just those responsible but upon many of you, upon many innocent people on

both sides. It is in large part for this reason that on 23 March of last year I proposed to the American people a new system of defense, one that actually defends our people from the threat of Soviet rockets, striking them down from the sky, without the current cruel necessity of threatening you, who have no voice in deciding these matters. But how are our intentions explained to you? You are told that we are planning a "first-strike" against the USSR. But for two decades after the Second World War, we possessed first a nuclear monopoly and then a clear superiority in nuclear forces. We had that "first strike" capability that your media tries to frighten you with: we didn't use it. There was no war although we could have destroyed the USSR with little damage to ourselves. But frankly, my friends, we are unwilling to take that same risk by permitting the USSR to achieve unchallenged superiority over us. And given the Soviet Union's behavior in the world I think you can readily see why.

My friends, I am not claiming that we are perfect, that our government never makes mistakes, that our society has no warts or blemishes. As I observed in a speech last year to a group of clergymen, our nation, too, has a legacy of evil with which it must deal. The glory of this land has been its capacity for transcending the moral evils of our past. For example, the

20

long struggle of minority citizens for equal rights, once a source of disunity and civil war, is now a point of pride for all Americans. There is no room for racism, anti-semitism, or other forms of ethnic and racial hatred in this country. And we have made great strides in overcoming these problems. But of course we still have such problems as every country has, as Russia surely had before the communists, and still has today, problems which will exist as long as people do and have not attained perfection. In some ways we are better than some countries, in others we may be worse. But our problems are in the open, aboveboard; they are discussed, debated; solutions are proposed. Unlike in your unfortunate land, where evil deeds and the corpses of millions of victims are hidden under a blanket of lies and ideology, our policy is and always has been to face the truth and deal honestly with our ills, however unpleasant this may be. And our society's goal is clear, as we, each one of us, become better people: to live up to the principle embodied in the Biblical commandment: "Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself."

My friends, we are determined to stand up for what is right. We will never compromise our principles and standards. We will never give away our freedom. We will never abandon our belief in God, a belief which permeates our history and our

government. Our Declaration of Independence from Great Britain, the basic document that marks our emergence as a distinct people, mentions the Supreme Being no less than four times. The phrase "In God We Trust" is engraved on our coinage. Our Supreme Court opens its proceedings with a religious invocation. And our Congress opens its sessions with a prayer. Our commitment to freedom and personal liberty is itself grounded in the much deeper realization that freedom prospers only where the blessings of God are avidly sought and humbly accepted. The entire American experiment in democracy rests on this insight. Its discovery was the great triumph of our Founding Fathers, voiced by our William Penn when he said: "If we will not be governed by God, we must be governed by tyrants." And it was our first President, George Washington, who said that "of all the dispositions and habits which lead to political prosperity, religion and morality are indispensable supports."

Indeed, my friends, perhaps the whole American concept of government can be summed up in a few sentences by Thomas Jefferson, our third President and author of our Declaration of Independence of 4 July 1776, in which appears these words:

We hold these truths to be self-evident, that all Men are created equal, that they are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable Rights, that among these are Life, Liberty, and the pursuit of Happiness. That to secure these rights, Governments are instituted among men, deriving their just powers from the consent of the governed. . ."

This concept is just as valid, as vital, as meaningful for us today -- and for all peoples -- as it was when Jefferson first penned those lines over two hundred years ago. Human beings have rights not because of their class, their nationality, or their race, not at the whim of any party or state, not conditioned on some crude materialist explanation of history -- but because it is the Creator who has given us those rights and endowed each of us with an intrinsic dignity and value as a human being. For that reason, even the least among us has an absolute value and the right to be respected by our fellow men. The rights of all people, of Americans and Russians and of all nations, cannot be taken away by any force. No government can eternally rule without a thought to the rights and wishes of its people. The peoples of your country, along with all other nations, have the right to true self-determination, to expect their rightful

place among the nations of the world -- in honor, in dignity, and in peace. All of you, no less than the people who elected me, have the right to expect your leaders to work for a genuine peace. With our countries' great power and grave responsibilities this is an absolute necessity.

In the months and years that lie ahead we must expect that there will be periods of difficulty. Certainly there will be high points and low in the relations between our government and the Soviet leaders. But whatever the state of official relations, let us be firm in our resolve that our peoples should look to one another as friends. For each of us, may the words of the psalmist be as a shield:

"Only with thine eyes shalt thou behold and see the reward of the wicked. Because thou hast made the Lord, which is my refuge, even the most High, thy habitation; there shall no evil befall thee, neither shall any plague come nigh thy dwelling. For he shall give his angels charge over thee, to keep thee in all thy ways."

May each of you, according to your own traditions and inclination, find in life a purpose and a fulfillment worthy of the highest aspirations of the human spirit. May anticipation of the approaching thousand-year commemoration of Russia's acceptance of the Christian faith give you greater strength with each passing day. May the warmth and brightness of the paschal season inspire in you a joyous sense of renewing life and shining resurrection. And finally, as I leave you, I ask you to be confident in the knowledge that all people of good will throughout the globe, especially those here in America, are always with you in our thoughts, in our hopes, and in our prayers.

God bless you.

WITHDRAWAL SHEET

Ronald Reagan Library

Collection Name
Raymond, Walter: Files

Withdrawer
KM 2/27/2012
L

File Folder
U.S.-SOVIET PUBLIC DIPLOMACY (04/16/1984-06/25/1984)

FOIA
M10-326/2
PARRY

Box Number
11

59

<i>ID</i>	<i>Document Type</i> <i>Document Description</i>	<i>No of</i> <i>pages</i>	<i>Doc Date</i>	<i>Restric-</i> <i>tions</i>
132374	MEMO TO WALTER RAYMOND RE PRESIDENTIAL SPEECH	4	4/12/1984	B1

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

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

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

THE WHITE HOUSE
WASHINGTON

27

Date: April 17, 1984

TO: Steve Steiner

FROM: LINAS KOJELIS *LK*
Associate Director
Office of Public Liaison
Room 438 OEOP, Ext. 2741

~~WR-FYI~~
F-USSR
2X

FYI

For Your Review

Please Return By _____

Comments

LK 4/16



THE WHITE HOUSE

WASHINGTON April 10, 1984

SCHEDULE PROPOSAL

TO: FREDERICK RYAN, DIRECTOR, PRESIDENTIAL APPOINTMENTS AND SCHEDULING

FROM: FAITH WHITTLESEY, ASSISTANT TO THE PRESIDENT FOR PUBLIC LIAISON *FHW*
ROBERT McFARLANE, ASSISTANT TO THE PRESIDENT FOR NATIONAL SECURITY AFFAIRS

REQUEST: For the President to host a White House concert of the Soviet Emigre Orchestra in honor of Andrei Sakharov.

PURPOSE: To express support for Soviet dissident Andrei Sakharov, the Soviet human rights movements and to recognize Americans working on behalf of human rights in the Soviet Union and Eastern Europe.

BACKGROUND: May 21 is the birthday of Andrei Sakharov, the Nobel Peace Prize winner and recognized leader of the human rights movement in the Soviet Union. In recent years, American supporters of Dr. Sakharov have organized public events in honor of him and other defenders of human rights to draw public attention to their oft forgotten struggle.

The Soviet Emigre Orchestra, an 18-piece all-string ensemble of world renown, is planning a U.S. and European concert tour as part of this effort. Their first concert will be at the Kennedy Center on May 16, 1984. The short concert at the White House would serve as a highly-publicized kick-off for this important tour, providing the White House an opportunity to honor Dr. Sakharov and the human rights movement in the Soviet Union and Eastern Europe.

PREVIOUS PARTICIPATION: Sakharov Day Proclamation Signing Ceremony, May 1983 in the Rose Garden.

DATE: May 5-15, 1984

LOCATION: The East Room

DURATION: 1 1/2 hours (The President could limit his participation to 15 minutes).

PARTICIPANTS:

150 leaders of East European-American communities, prominent Soviet and East European dissidents residing in the United States, and presidents of human rights organizations.

OUTLINE OF EVENT:

The President makes opening remarks. The orchestra would play several pieces (not longer than 30 minutes total). Guests would then go to the East Room for light refreshments (coffee and pastries).

REMARKS REQUIRED:

Brief remarks

MEDIA COVERAGE:

Full press

RECOMMENDED BY:

Faith Whittlesey, NSC

PROJECT OFFICER:

Linas Kojelis, x2741

29

WITHDRAWAL SHEET

Ronald Reagan Library

Collection Name
Raymond, Walter: Files

Withdrawer
KM 2/27/2012
L

File Folder
U.S.-SOVIET PUBLIC DIPLOMACY (04/16/1984-06/25/1984)

FOIA
M10-326/2
PARRY

Box Number
11

59

<i>ID</i>	<i>Document Type</i> <i>Document Description</i>	<i>No of</i> <i>pages</i>	<i>Doc Date</i>	<i>Restric-</i> <i>tions</i>
134374	NOTE FROM WALTER RAYMOND RE BOOK CLUB	1	5/24/1984	B3

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

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

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

8413810

31



LIETUVIŠKOS KNYGOS KLUBAS

4545 W. 63 STREET CHICAGO, ILLINOIS 60629

225650

April 30, 1984

Mr. Linas Kojelis
The White House
Washington, D.C.

Dear Mr. Kojelis:

My name is Father Vytautas Bagdanavičius and I am director of The Lithuanian Book Club, based in Chicago, which publishes books in the Lithuanian language by authors residing in the U.S. I was dismayed to learn that since about 1983 travelers to occupied Lithuania are being denied the right to keep among their personal possessions even a single book for their personal reading, if that book happens to be written in Lithuanian. The situation is especially embarrassing for travelers carrying books of a religious nature. Among the instructions issued to Soviet customs officials is that visitors are forbidden to have this type of book, in whatever language, in their possession when they enter the Soviet Union. I wonder if such a regulation is compatible with the Helsinki agreements?

I am requesting your assistance in two matters: 1/ in drawing the attention of responsible officials of the U.S. government to this fact and suggesting steps to prevent this violation of our citizens' rights by the Soviets, 2/ in recommending me to the proper channel in the State Department, which would be able to facilitate my sending a few books to The Most Reverend Liudvikas Povilonis, the Roman Catholic Bishop of Kaunas /233000 Kaunas, Vilnius 4, Lithuania/.

Respectfully,

Fr. Vt. Bagdanavičius, MIC
/Father/ Vytautas Bagdanavičius, MIC

Dear Father Bagdanavicius:

Thank you for the letter describing the difficulties which travellers to Lithuania are having in bringing in religious books to that country.

We are aware of this reprehensible behavior by Soviet customs officials, and we believe that this kind of anti-religious activity is indicative of the fear which the Soviet Union has for any manifestations of personal belief that do not conform to its own rigid and atheistic ideology. Unfortunately, so long as the U.S.S.R. continues to exercise control over Lithuania, there is little that can be done to change Soviet customs procedures.

With regard to your request for a sure method to send books to Bishop Povilonis, it is not possible to facilitate this effort without putting the Lithuanian recipients at very substantial risk.

We have sought for many years to encourage the Soviets to allow better information and media exchanges. Your thoughtful letter describing the unjust customs procedures affecting Lithuania reminds us of how much remains to be done in this area.

Sincerely,

Father Vytautas Bagdanavicius MIC,
Lietuviskos Knygos Klubas,
4545 West 63rd Street,
Chicago, Illinois.

32

MEMORANDUM

NATIONAL SECURITY COUNCIL

F- US/Sov. 4831

*Raymond
132375*

CONFIDENTIAL

June 25, 1984

*Text.
Jerryle*

ACTION

MEMORANDUM FOR ROBERT C. MCFARLANE

FROM: JACK MATLOCK *JM*

SUBJECT: Presidential Statement to Conference on Soviet Exchanges, June 27

Attached at TAB I is my rewrite of State's suggested text for the President's statement to participants in the Conference on U.S.-Soviet Exchanges, scheduled for 1:00 P.M. June 27.

I have tried to include the following elements:

-- A comprehensive review of the proposals we have made to the Soviets in the bilateral area (drawing on the State text);

-- A frank explanation of the dilemma faced in expanding exchanges when Soviet behavior requires us to protest; and

-- An implicit, but tactful, challenge to the Soviets to move in this area if they are as devoted to peace as they say they are -- worded so as to indicate that we have reasons to doubt their devotion to true peace.

The text has not yet been coordinated with the speechwriters or with State, but if you approve it, we will proceed with the coordination.

Recommendation:

That you approve the text at TAB I for coordination with the speechwriters and State.

Approve *JM* Disapprove

9/5 mod

Attachments:

- Tab I - Suggested text of President's statement to the Smithsonian Conference
- Tab II - State draft

Copies to: John Lenczowski
Walt Raymond
Steve Sestanovich

CONFIDENTIAL

Declassify on: OADR

DECLASSIFIED
NLRR M324/2 # 132375
BY *fw* NARA DATE *6/8/18*

34

STATEMENT TO SMITHSONIAN CONFERENCE

Thank you for coming over to the White House today. When I heard that you would be meeting at the Smithsonian to discuss U.S.-Soviet exchanges, I was eager to have a chance to meet you and to share with you my thoughts on this most important topic.

First, I want to congratulate the Woodrow Wilson Center and the Carnegie ^{Endowment (?)} ~~Corporation~~ [?] of New York for organizing your conference. These institutions are outstanding examples of the American search for knowledge and communication with the world at large. And right now there is no topic more worthy of our attention than ways we can reach out and establish better communication with the people and government of the Soviet Union.

In my January address on U.S.-Soviet relations I suggested that the U.S. and Soviet governments make a major effort to see if we could make progress in three broad problem areas: reducing the threat and use of force in solving international disputes, reducing armaments in the world, and establishing a better working relationship with each other. We have been working hard to secure Soviet cooperation in all these areas.

I've had a lot to say recently about our efforts to establish a dialogue on regional issues and on arms reduction and control. Today I would like to describe to you what we are proposing to establish a better working relationship with the Soviet Union. If these proposals are accepted, they could open up new avenues for your own efforts.

First, we have informed the Soviet Government that we are prepared to initiate negotiations on a new exchanges agreement, and we have completed our preparations for these negotiations.

Second, we have proposed that we resume preparations to open consulates general in New York and Kiev.

Third, we have taken steps to reinvigorate our agreements for cooperation in the fields of environmental protection, housing, health and agriculture. Activities under these agreements have waned in recent years, since there have been no meetings of their joint committees to plan projects. We have proposed that preparations begin for such meetings in order to increase the number of active projects.

Fourth, we are in the process of renewing several agreements which otherwise would have expired this year.

-- We have proposed extending our fishing agreement for 18 months and are looking at possibilities to increase cooperation under it.

-- We have proposed that our Agreement to Facilitate Economic, Industrial and Technological Cooperation be renewed for another ten years, and that preparations begin for a meeting of our Joint Commercial Commission.

-- A U.S. Navy delegation held talks this month with their Soviet counterparts in accord with our agreement on avoiding incidents at sea, and we have agreed to extend that useful agreement for another three years.

-- We are reviewing the World Oceans Agreement, which has been useful in promoting joint oceanographic research, and will give careful thought to renewing it when it expires in December.

Finally, we have made proposals in several other areas in order to solve problems, improve our dialogue and foster cooperation.

-- We have proposed a fair and equitable resolution of our differences on the exact depiction of the maritime boundary off Alaska.

-- We have proposed a joint simulated space rescue mission in which astronauts and cosmonauts would carry out a combined exercise in space to develop techniques to rescue people from malfunctioning space vehicles.

-- We recently concluded another round of talks on consular matters, in which we are trying to improve visa procedures and facilitate travel between our countries.

-- We have suggested discussions between the U.S. Coast Guard and the Soviet Ministry of Merchant Marine on search and rescue procedures to assist citizens of all countries lost at sea.

-- We have made progress in our talks on upgrading the Hotline, and have proposed measures to deal with nuclear terrorist incidents, establishing a Joint Military Communications Line, and upgrading embassy communications in both countries.

-- We have put forward a specific set of steps to improve navigation aids along the North Pacific air routes to ensure that the KAL tragedy never recurs.

-- We have suggested that we establish regular, high-level contacts between military personnel of our two countries.

As you can see, we have been working as hard to improve communication and our working relationship with the Soviets, as

37

we have to persuade them to join us in finding ways to reduce arms and settle disputes without the use of force. We cannot yet judge the results: ^{All of our proposals are rejected} some of our proposals have been rejected -- at least for the moment; a few are near agreement; and many others are still under discussion. But one thing is certain. We want to move ahead.

We don't expect that to be easy. Opening up contact and communication with a closed society governed by exceedingly suspicious officials can never be easy. I am as disturbed as you are by recent reports of new steps which have been taken by Soviet authorities to restrict their citizens' contacts with foreigners. And these come on top of intensified repression of many persons who have dared express views contrary to those of their political leaders. The people of the Soviet Union pay the greatest price for such practices, but we are all affected.

When attempts are made to seal off great, proud, accomplished peoples from outside influence, two things happen. First, their own intellectual and cultural life suffers. And second, the rest of the world is deprived of the cultural riches and intellectual stimulation they can offer.

Sometimes, if we get preoccupied with our political and ideological differences, we may not think enough about this. But we all know that Russian writers, composers and scientists are a part of our own heritage. What American does not think of Tchaikowsky as one of his favorite composers? And what would our literature be like without Tolstoy, Dostoevsky and Chekhov? Or chemistry without Mendelejev? I could give many more examples,

but the point is clear: we all have a stake in keeping contacts and communication as broad and deep and unfettered as possible.

While our main problem, for decades, has been the Soviet propensity to seal their people off, or to filter and control the flow of contacts and information, we too have sometimes made decisions that led to a decrease in contacts, though that was never our purpose or goal. For example, some of the cooperative agreements which we would like to revive have been languishing in part because of our refusal, following the Soviet invasion of Afghanistan, to hold high-level meetings.

Here, frankly, we face a dilemma. When Soviet actions threaten the peace, or violate solemn agreements, or trample on standards essential to civilized mankind, we cannot be silent or continue to deal with the perpetrators as if nothing had happened. To do so would not only betray our deepest values and violate our conscience; it would also ultimately undermine world stability and our ability to keep the peace. We must have ways short of military threats to make it crystal clear that Soviet actions do matter and that some will inevitably affect the quality of the relationship.

But we have to bear something else in mind. That is, that our quarrel is not with the Russian people, or the Ukrainian people, or any of the other proud nationalities living in that enormous multinational state. [(Pause) I can think of another word for it, but don't want to be accused of indulging in rhetoric.] We wish the peoples of the Soviet Union well, and want only to live in peace and cooperation with them. And we're sure they want the same with us. So we must be careful, in reacting to

actions by their government, not to take out our indignation on those not responsible.

That is why I feel that we should move to broaden opportunities for Americans and Soviet citizens to get to know each other better. Our proposals are not a "signal" that we have forgotten Afghanistan. We have not, and we will continue to demonstrate our sympathy for the people of that ~~ravished~~^{ravaged} land, and will support their desire to rid themselves of foreign occupiers and reestablish an independence and neutrality which could threaten no one.

Our proposals also do not mean that we ignore violations of the Helsinki Final Act, or the plight in which the Soviet authorities have placed some of their noblest citizens. Andrei Sakharov, Yelena Bonner, Anatoly Shcharansky, Yuri Orlov and many others weigh heavily on our hearts, and it would be misleading to imply that their treatment and fate will not have an effect on our ability to increase cooperation with the Soviet Union. It will, and we all know it. Not because I want it that way, or you want it that way, but because our own consciences, and those of the American people, will have it no other way.

I know that these thoughts do not resolve the dilemma I mentioned. If they did, it wouldn't be a dilemma. But it is a dilemma for all of us, and I will value any advice that you, who have so much experience in dealing with the Soviet Union, may have for me.

You know, I don't think there is anything we are encouraging the Soviet leaders to do that is not as much in their interest as it is in ours -- and the whole world's. If they are as committed

to peace as they say they are they should welcome our outstretched hand and join us in a dialogue aimed at solving problems. If they really want to reduce arms, there's no excuse for refusing to talk about ways to do just that. And if they want to deal with us as equals -- which is quite natural, and in fact the only way to treat each other -- then they wouldn't try to avoid a frank discussion of real problems.

Some say that the Soviet leaders are not really interested in peace but only in avoiding war while they use their military power to spread their dominance. A lot of things they are doing certainly seem to support this interpretation. But even if this is the case, it should be clear by now that it's not going to work. Once they realize that, maybe they'll see more clearly that they have as much to gain as everyone else from improving our dialogue, solving some problems and reducing tensions.

So I'm not going to stop trying to get our relations on a better track.

Your efforts will be very important. The best way governments can promote contacts among people is to avoid standing in the way. We in the American government will do all we can in conscience to stay out of the way, and to persuade the Soviet government to do the same. We all know this isn't going happen overnight. But if we are successful, or even partially successful, it's going to be up to you to do the real work of getting a lot more Americans into wider and more meaningful contact with a lot more Soviet citizens.

With all the problems in our relations, it may seem an impossible dream to think there could be a time when Americans

and Soviet citizens of all walks of life could travel freely back and forth, visit each other's homes, look up friends and professional colleagues, work together on all sorts of problems and, if they feel like it, sit up all night talking about the meaning of life and the different ways they look at the world. All these things we take for granted with most countries of the world. We should never accept the idea that it should not be the normal way of interacting with people in the Soviet Union as well. When you think about it, doesn't it give you as clear a picture of true peace as you can imagine?

As distant as it may seem, I don't believe it's an impossible dream. And I hope you don't either. Let's dedicate ourselves to making it a reality.