

Ronald Reagan Presidential Library Digital Library Collections

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

Collection: Speechwriting, White House Office of:
Research Office, 1981-1989
Folder Title: 06/12/1987 Brandenburg Gate/Berlin
(Peter/Teresa) (2)
Box: 325

To see more digitized collections visit:
<https://reaganlibrary.gov/archives/digital-library>

To see all Ronald Reagan Presidential Library inventories visit:
<https://reaganlibrary.gov/document-collection>

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

Citation Guidelines: <https://reaganlibrary.gov/citing>

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

WITHDRAWAL SHEET

Ronald Reagan Library

Collection: SPEECHWRITING, WHO OF: Research Office Records

Archivist: ggc

File Folder: Brandenburg Gate/Berlin, 6/12/87, Peter/Teresa [2 of 3]

Date: 1/21/97

DA 18100

DOCUMENT NO. AND TYPE	SUBJECT/TITLE	DATE	RESTRICTION
1. speech draft	Brandenburg Gate, 6/12/87, 9:00am, p. 1 (1p, partial)	5/29/87	P5
2. speech draft	item #1, p. 4-8 (5pp., partial)	5/29/87	P5
3. memo	to Rhett Dawson from Grant Green re Brandenburg Gate (1p)	5/27/87	P5
4. memo	re NSC comments on revised Brandenburg Gate Address (1p)	n.d.	P5 <i>CCB 12/20/00</i>

RESTRICTION CODES

Presidential Records Act - [44 U.S.C. 2204(a)]

- P-1 National security classified information [(a)(1) of the PRA].
- P-2 Relating to appointment to Federal office [(a)(2) of the PRA].
- P-3 Release would violate a Federal statute [(a)(3) of the PRA].
- P-4 Release would disclose trade secrets or confidential commercial or financial information [(a)(4) of the PRA].
- P-5 Release would disclose confidential advice between the President and his advisors, or between such advisors [(a)(5) of the PRA].
- P-6 Release would constitute a clearly unwarranted invasion of personal privacy [(a)(6) of the PRA].

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

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

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

WITHDRAWAL SHEET

Ronald Reagan Library

Collection: SPEECHWRITING, WHO OF: Research Office Records

Archivist: ggc

File Folder: Brandenburg Gate/Berlin, 6/12/87, Peter/Teresa [2 of 3]

Date: 1/21/97

DOCUMENT NO. AND TYPE	SUBJECT/TITLE	DATE	RESTRICTION
1. speech draft	Brandenburg Gate, 6/12/87, 9:00am, p. 1 (1p, partial)	5/29/87	P5
2. speech draft	item #1, p. 4-8 (5pp., partial)	5/29/87	P5
3. memo	to Rhett Dawson from Grant Green re Brandenburg Gate (1p)	5/27/87	P5
4. memo	re NSC comments on revised Brandenburg Gate Address (1p)	n.d.	P5

RESTRICTION CODES

Presidential Records Act - [44 U.S.C. 2204(a)]

- P-1 National security classified information [(a)(1) of the PRA].
- P-2 Relating to appointment to Federal office [(a)(2) of the PRA].
- P-3 Release would violate a Federal statute [(a)(3) of the PRA].
- P-4 Release would disclose trade secrets or confidential commercial or financial information [(a)(4) of the PRA].
- P-5 Release would disclose confidential advice between the President and his advisors, or between such advisors [(a)(5) of the PRA].
- P-6 Release would constitute a clearly unwarranted invasion of personal privacy [(a)(6) of the PRA].

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

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

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

(TR)

NATIONAL SECURITY COUNCIL
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20508

3933 Add-on

May 29, 1987

MEMORANDUM FOR ANTHONY R. DOLAN

FROM: GRANT S. GREEN, JR.

SUBJECT: Presidential Address: Brandenburg Gate (Revised)

Attached are specific changes that the NSC strongly recommends.

We will want to look at the next draft as well and perhaps make further suggestions next week.

Attachment

Tab A Draft Presidential Address

cc: Rhett Dawson

WHITE HOUSE STAFFING MEMORANDUMDATE: 5/29/87 ACTION/CONCURRENCE/COMMENT DUE BY: 2:00 p.m. TODAYSUBJECT: PRESIDENTIAL ADDRESS: BRANDENBURG GATE (REVISED)
(5/29 -- 9:00 a.m. draft)

	ACTION FYI			ACTION FYI	
VICE PRESIDENT	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	FITZWATER	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
BAKER	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	GRISCOM	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
DUBERSTEIN	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	HENKEL	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
MILLER - OMB	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	HOBBS	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
BALL	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	KING	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
BAUER	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	MASENG	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
CARLUCCI	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	RISQUE	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
CRIBB	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	RYAN	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
CRIPPEN	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	SPRINKEL	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
CULVAHOUSE	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	TUTTLE	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
DAWSON	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	DOLAN	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
DONATELLI	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

REMARKS:

Please provide any comments on the attached revised address directly to Tony Dolan by 2:00 p.m. today, with an info copy to my office. Thank you.

RESPONSE: FOR: TONY DOLAN

NSC recommends the changes marked on the attached.

cc: Rhett Dawson

Grant S. Green, Jr.
Executive SecretaryRhett Dawson
Ext. 2702

(Robinson)
May 29, 1987
9:00 a.m.

Nsc
changes

PRESIDENTIAL ADDRESS: BRANDENBURG GATE
WEST BERLIN, GERMANY
FRIDAY, JUNE 12, 1987

Chancellor Kohl, Governing Mayor Diepgen, ladies and gentlemen: Twenty-four years ago, President John F. Kennedy visited Berlin, speaking to the people of this city and the world ~~from the City Hall, at the Rudolph Wilde Platz~~ Since then, two other Presidents have come, each in his turn, to Berlin. Today I myself make my second visit to your city.

It's
remembered
this way

We come to Berlin, we American Presidents, because it is our duty to speak, in this place, of freedom. But I must confess, we are drawn here by other things as well: By the feeling of history in this city, more than 500 years older than our own Nation. By the sense of energy in your streets. By the beauty of the Grunewald and the Tiergarten. Most of all, by your courage and friendship.

[Perhaps Marlene Dietrich understood something about American Presidents. You see, like so many Presidents before me, I come here today because wherever I go, whatever I do:

"Ich hab noch einen koffer in Berlin." ["I still have a suitcase in Berlin" -- words from a much-loved song.]

Our gathering today is being broadcast throughout Western Europe and North America. I understand that it is being seen and heard as well in the East -- that Berlin television can be seen as far to the southeast as Leipzig, as far to the northeast as Gdansk; that Berlin radio can be picked up as far due east as Moscow.

We
still think
this has
wrong
tone --
nostalgia +
abandonment,
not
commitment
(+ Dietrich
is not
really
identified
with it)

To those listening throughout Eastern Europe, I extend my warmest greetings and the goodwill of the American people. To those listening in East Berlin, a special word. Although I cannot be with you, I address my remarks to you just as surely as to those standing here before me. For I join you as I join your fellow ^{Countrymen} ~~(citizens)~~ in the West in this firm, this unalterable belief: [In German:] *Es gibt nur ein Berlin.* There is only one Berlin.

We recognize 2 citizenships

-- part of a barrier

Wall, as such, doesn't go whole way

Behind me stands a wall that divides the entire continent of Europe. From the Baltic south it cuts across Germany in one continuous gash of concrete, barbed wire, guard towers, dog runs, and gun emplacements. ^{In some places} ~~(on borders farther south)~~ there may be no visible, no obvious wall. But there remain armed guards and checkpoints all the same -- still a restriction on the right to travel, still an instrument to impose upon ordinary men and women the will of a totalitarian state.

Yet it is here in Berlin where the wall emerges most clearly; here, cutting across your city, where the newsphoto and the television screen have imprinted this brutal division of a continent upon the mind of the world. Standing before the Brandenburg Gate, any man is a German, separated from his fellow men. Any man is a Berliner, forced to look upon a scar.

President von Weizsaecker has said: The German question is open as long as the Brandenburg Gate is closed. Today I say: As long as this gate is closed, as long as this scar of a wall is permitted to stand, it is not the German question alone that remains open, but the question of freedom for all mankind.

Yet I do not come here to lament. For I find in Berlin a message of hope -- even, in the shadow of this wall, a message of triumph.

In this season of spring in 1945, the people of Berlin emerged from their air-raid shelters to find devastation.

[Streets choked with rubble. One building in five destroyed. Tens of thousands lying dead.] Thousands of miles away, the people of the United States reached out to help. In announcing the Marshall Plan, Secretary of State George Marshall stated precisely 40 years ago this week: "Our policy is directed not against any country or doctrine, but against hunger, poverty, desperation, and chaos."

In the Reichstag a few moments ago, I saw a display commemorating this 40th anniversary of the Marshall Plan. I was struck by the sign on a burnt-out, gutted structure that was being rebuilt. I understand that Berliners of my own generation can remember seeing signs like it dotted throughout the Western sectors of the city. The sign read simply: "The Marshall Plan at work. For the building of a Free World."

"[T]he building of a Free World" -- in the West, that building took place. Japan rose from ruin to become an economic giant. Germany and its neighbors each saw political and economic rebirth. The European Community was founded.

In West Germany and here in Berlin, there took place an economic miracle, the "Wirtschaftswunder." Adenauer, Erhard, Reuter, and other leaders understood the practical importance of liberty -- that just as truth can flourish only when the

Cannot
list only
a few.
(16 countries
took part in
Marshall
Plan)

journalist is given freedom of speech, so prosperity can come about only when the farmer and businessman enjoy economic freedom. The German leaders reduced tariffs, expanded free trade, lowered taxes. From 1950 to 1960 alone, the standard of living in West Germany and [West] Berlin more than doubled.

Where four decades ago there was rubble, today in West Berlin there is the greatest industrial output of any city in Germany; busy office blocks; fine homes and apartments; proud avenues and the spreading lawns of parkland. Where a city's culture seemed to have been destroyed, today there are two great universities, orchestras and an opera, countless theaters and museums. Where there was want, today there is abundance ~~of~~ food, clothing, automobiles; the wonderful goods of the Ku'damm; even home computers.]

From devastation -- from utter ruin -- you Berliners have in freedom rebuilt a city that once again ranks as one of the greatest on Earth. The Soviets may have had other plans. [But, my friends, there was one thing the Soviets didn't count on: Berliner schnauze. Ja, Berliner schnauze -- und mit herz. ["Berliner schnauze" is a well-known phrase meaning courage mixed with good humor, "chutzpah." "Und mit herz" means "and with heart."]

In the 1960's, Khrushchev predicted: "We will bury you." But in the West today, we see a free world that has achieved a level of prosperity and well-being unprecedented in all human history. In the ~~East~~ ^{Communist world}, we see ~~failure~~ ^{stagnation}. Technological backwardness. Declining standards of health. Even want of the

Before the
Wall, Berlin
was less
divided

Bad
(Roz
agrees)

most basic kind -- too little food. The Soviet Union still cannot feed itself. East Germany has made strides, but at harvest time the news announcers still speak, to use the well-known phrase, of "the battle to bring in the crops."

After these four decades, then, there stands before the entire world one great and inescapable conclusion. Freedom leads to prosperity. ^{And} freedom replaces the ancient hatreds between the nations with comity and peace.

Freiheit -- Freiheit ist der Sieger. [Freedom is the victor.]

Now the Soviets themselves may at last be coming to understand the importance of freedom. We hear much from Moscow about a new policy of openness and reform, ^{in their own way,} ~~to use the Russian term, "glasnost."~~ Some political prisoners have been released. Certain foreign news broadcasts are no longer being jammed. Some economic enterprises have been permitted to operate with greater freedom from state control.

Are these the beginnings of profound changes in the Soviet state? Or are they token gestures, intended only to raise false hopes in the West? ^{or to strengthen the system without changing it?} We ^{welcome} ~~want to encourage~~ change and openness. ^{Because} ~~We~~ we believe the advance of freedom and the strengthening of ^{Don't} ~~want new agreements~~ ^{fit or} ~~especially those that will reduce nuclear~~ ^{track well} ~~arms.~~ security go together.

There is one sign the Soviets can make that would be unmistakable, that would ^{increase the trust among nations} ~~advance dramatically~~ the cause of ^{both} ~~understanding between nations~~ peace and freedom.

[General Secretary Gorbachev, if you seek peace, come ^{back} to Berlin. If you seek prosperity for the Soviet Union and Eastern

May give them too much credit

Inaccurate: Openness = glasnost. reform = perestroika (restructuring).

Not aimed mainly at Western opinion. "Encouraging" change means Genscher line, i.e., paying tribute

Since he will have just been here (May 28-9), this device seems silly, even as edited

Europe, come ^{back} to Berlin. If you seek liberalization -- if you seek "glasnost" -- come ^{back} to Berlin.

Come here, to this gate, ^{not to a plush conference hall down the road.}

Why this in
German,
and not
this. →

Herr Gorbachev, machen Sie dieses Tor auf. [Mr. Gorbachev, open this gate.]]

Mr. Gorbachev, tear down this wall.

While we watch and wait, we in the West must resist Soviet expansion. So we must maintain defenses of unassailable strength. Yet it is our nature as free peoples to make manifest our goodwill. So we must strive to reduce arms on both sides.

Soviet missiles
were there before.
Need to
clarify what
was new

Beginning 10 years ago, the Soviets challenged the Western Alliance with a grave new threat: the deployment of ^{new and more deadly} hundreds of ^{-- the triple-warhead SS-20s --} nuclear missiles, capable of striking every capital in Europe.

The Western Alliance responded by committing itself to a

counter-deployment -- unless the Soviets agreed to negotiate a

^{namely to eliminate these weapons on both sides.} better solution, For many months, the Soviets refused to ^{bargain} ~~come to~~

^{seriously.} ~~the table~~ As the Alliance ~~(in turn)~~ prepared to go forward with

its counter-deployment, there were difficult days -- days of

protests like those during my 1982 visit to this city. ^{And the Soviets} ~~walked away from the table.~~

But through it all, the Alliance held firm. And I invite

those who protested then -- I invite those who protest today --

to mark this fact: Because we remained strong, the Soviets came ^{back}

to the table. Because we remained strong, today we are engaged

in talks that hold out the possibility, not merely of limiting

the growth of arms, but of eliminating, for the first time, an

entire class of nuclear weapons from the face of the Earth.

Wrong:
They talked,
but not
seriously;
then walked
out

I understand the fear of war and the pain of division that afflict this continent. As I speak, NATO ministers are meeting in Iceland to review the progress of our proposals for the complete elimination of intermediate-range nuclear forces that I mentioned. At the talks in Geneva, we have proposed deep cuts in strategic forces ^{as well.} And the Western Allies have ~~likewise~~ made far-reaching proposals to reduce the danger of conventional war, and to place a total ban on chemical weapons.

While we pursue these arms reductions, I pledge to you that we will maintain the capacity to deter Soviet aggression at any level at which it might occur. And in cooperation with many of our Allies, the United States is pursuing a Strategic Defense Initiative -- research ^{to find a way to} ~~that will~~ base deterrence not on the threat of offensive retaliation, but on ~~strategic~~ defenses that truly defend; on ~~defenses~~ ^{systems,} in short, that will protect ^{human} lives ~~not~~ ^{instead of} ~~targeting~~ ^{them.} ~~populations but by shielding them.~~

Yes, our ~~defenses are~~ ^{strength is} crucial -- but only the means to something far greater: the life of freedom. ^{In} ~~Perhaps when~~ President Kennedy ^{'s time,} ~~spoke at the Rudolph Wilde Platz those 24 years~~

~~ago~~ it was freedom that was encircled, Berlin that was under siege. No longer. Despite all the pressures upon this city, Berlin stands secure in its liberty. And today freedom itself is transforming the globe.

In the Philippines; in ~~Argentina, Brazil, and across Latin~~ ^{Throughout South and Central} America, democracy has been given a rebirth. Throughout the Pacific, free markets are working miracle after miracle of economic growth. ~~even the People's Republic of China has~~

PRC has regressed recently. Can make point more broadly

Again
Canno
menti
only a
few

Accuracy
(we don't
know
results)

Too many
different
meanings
of
"defenses"

Wrong:
Berlin crises
ended after
Wall went
up. (In
another
sense, it's
still
surrounded
& under
siege.)

~~Granted certain economic freedoms~~ In the industrialized nations, a technological revolution is taking place -- a revolution marked by rapid, dramatic advances in computers and telecommunications. *Even in the Communist world, the economic and moral bankruptcy of central state control is beginning to be understood.*

In Europe, only one nation and those it controls refuse to join the community of freedom. Yet in this age of redoubled economic growth, of information and innovation, the Soviet Union ^{itself} faces a choice. It must make fundamental changes. Or it will become obsolete.

In this respect, today represents a moment of hope. We in the West stand ready to cooperate with the East to promote true openness -- to break down the barriers that separate people, to create a safer, freer world. And surely there is no better place than Berlin, the meetingplace of East and West, to make a start.

Free people of Berlin, ~~I urge you to reach out to the East. Reach out, setting an example of goodwill. Reach out, demonstrating to your neighbors the powerful example of freedom.~~

~~Mayor Diepgen~~ today as in the past, the United States stands for the strict observance and full implementation of all parts of the Four-Power Agreement of 1971. ^{Let us use this} ~~Yet today, on this,~~ ^{to usher in} ~~the 750th anniversary of the founding of this city, we look back~~ ^{a new era,} ~~only to the city's defense, but to building for Berlin~~ a still fuller, richer life for the future. Let us strive ^{together} ~~for more~~

~~Complete implementation of the Four Power Agreement especially to maintain and develop the~~ ~~the provisions that call for~~ ties between the Federal Republic and the Western sectors of Berlin. ~~And I challenge Mr. Gorbachev:~~ ^{And I challenge Mr. Gorbachev:} ~~Within Berlin itself,~~ ^{this great} Let us work to bring the two parts of ~~the~~ city closer together, so that

Bad -
Diepgen has
tried solo
initiatives
against
Allied wishes
(Roz's
point)

Wrong:
4-Power
Pact had
nothing to do
with
defense

Need to
dramatize
better that he's
offering a new
initiative

(June 1:
is no
"the"
answer)

all the inhabitants of all Berlin can enjoy the benefits that should come with life in one of the great cities of the world.

With our French and British partners, the United States is prepared to sponsor international meetings in Berlin. It would be only fitting for Berlin to serve as the site of ^{United Nations meetings, or} world conferences on human rights ^{or other issues or} ~~and~~ arms control, ~~areas that call~~ ^{areas of international cooperation.} ~~for cooperation between East and West.~~ ¶ There is no better way to establish hope for the future than to enlighten young minds, and ~~we~~ ^{we} ~~American authorities in Berlin~~ would be honored to sponsor summer youth exchanges, cultural events, and other programs for young Berliners from the East. Our French and British friends, I'm ~~certain, will be~~ ^{an} indicated that they ~~are~~ prepared to do the same. ^{It is my hope} ~~that~~ ^{similar} ~~an~~ authority could be found in East Berlin to sponsor ^{visits} ~~for~~ ^{from} young people ~~here in~~ the Western sectors.

To open Berlin still further to all Europe, East and West, ~~let us~~ ^{let us} ~~the United States seeks to greatly~~ expand the vital air ~~access~~ ^{corridors} to this city; ~~let us~~ ^{let us} find ways of making commercial air service to Berlin through the established corridors safer, more comfortable, and more economical. ~~We~~ ^{look to the day when West} ~~can~~ ^{can become} Berlin as one of the chief aviation hubs in all Central Europe.

One final proposal -- one close to my heart. Sport represents a source of enjoyment and ennoblement, and you may have noted that the Republic of Korea -- South Korea -- has offered to permit certain events of the 1988 Olympics to take place in the North. International sports competitions of all kinds could take place in both parts of this city. And what better way to show goodwill ~~toward the East~~ -- what better way to

Add this

Not just East-West issues

Should be "West Berlin"

demonstrate to the world the openness of this city -- than in some future year to ^{ask to hold an} ~~hold the~~ Olympic Games here in Berlin, East and West?

Let's not just talk about openness, Mr. Gorbachev. Let's make it a reality right here in [Berlin City] Berlin.

In these four decades, as I have said, you Berliners have rebuilt a great city. You have done so in spite of threats: The Soviet attempts to impose the East-mark. The blockade. Today the city thrives in spite of the challenges implicit in the very presence of this wall.

What keeps you here?

What persuades you to stay when you could so easily ^{move} ~~travel~~ *some other city in* to the West?

No, West Berlin is part of "the West"

I spoke earlier of "Berliner schnauze," and of course there is a great deal to be said for your *Fortitude, and* ~~for~~ your defiant courage, *are certainly part of the answer.*

will But I believe that there is something deeper. Something that involves Berlin's whole look and feel and way of life. Not mere sentiment -- no one could live long in Berlin without being completely disabused of illusions. Something instead that sees the difficulties of life in Berlin but chooses to ^{surmount} ~~accept~~ them. That stubbornly *insists on expanding life and vitality.* ~~refuses to abandon this good and proud city to a surrounding presence that is merely brutish.~~ Something that speaks with a powerful voice of affirmation -- that says yes to this city, yes to the future, yes to freedom. In a word, I would submit that what keeps you in Berlin is love -- love both profound and abiding.

Perhaps this gets to the root of the matter, to the most fundamental distinction of all between East and West. The totalitarian world does not produce low living standards and

backwardness because of some technical shortcoming in its economic arrangements. It produces backwardness because it does such violence to the spirit, thwarting the human impulse to create, to enjoy, to worship.

The totalitarian world finds even symbols of love an affront. During the War, the sculpture atop the Brandenburg Gate was taken down for safekeeping and stored here, in the Western sectors of the city. In 19__, the West turned the sculpture over to the East in a gesture of goodwill, and soon the sculpture was once again looking out upon "Unter den Linden" [the main avenue in East Berlin]. But something was different. The cross -- the cross the figure had borne aloft for nearly 150 years -- that cross was gone. In its place was a Communist wreath.

Are
you
sure?

__ years later, authorities in the East erected what is now the tallest structure in the city, the television tower above Alexanderplatz. I understand that virtually ever since, the authorities have been working to correct what they view as the tower's one major flaw, treating the glass dome at the top with paints and chemicals of every kind. Yet even today when the sun strikes that dome -- that dome that towers over all Berlin -- the light makes the sign of the cross.

(They may
have
succeeded.)

As I looked out a moment ago from the Reichstag -- that embodiment of German unity -- I noticed words crudely spray-painted upon the wall -- perhaps by a young Berliner -- words that answer the German question. "This wall will fall. Beliefs become reality."

Yes, across Europe, this wall will fall. For it cannot withstand faith. It cannot withstand truth.

Die Mauer kann Freiheit nicht zuruckhalten. [The wall cannot withstand freedom.]

Thank you. God bless you all.

asc
Nelson Ledsky
5646

Tom
Watson
Polit. Sec. - W. Berlin

(Robinson/ARD)
June 1, 1987
6:00 p.m.

Teresa

RR

PRESIDENTIAL ADDRESS: BRANDENBURG GATE
~~BERLIN~~ BERLIN, GERMANY
(fun. vitz. ec) FRIDAY, JUNE 12, 1987

Rathaus
President Ronald Reagan
Chancellor Kohl, Governing Mayor Diepgen, ladies and gentlemen: Twenty-four years ago, President John F. Kennedy visited Berlin, speaking to the people of this city and the world at the City Hall. Since then, two other Presidents have come, each in his turn, to Berlin. Today I myself make my second visit to your city.

We come to Berlin, we American Presidents, because it is our duty to speak, in this place, of freedom. But I must confess, we are drawn here by other things as well: By the feeling of history in this city, more than 500 years older than our own Nation. By the sense of energy in your streets. By the beauty of the Grunewald and the Tiergarten. Most of all, by your courage and friendship.

Perhaps the composer Paul Lincke understood something about American Presidents. You see, like so many Presidents before me,

I come here today because wherever I go, whatever I do:

Ish hob knock Tnen coffer in Ber leen
"Ich hab noch einen koffer in Berlin." ["I still have a suitcase in Berlin" -- words from a much-loved song.]

Our gathering today is being broadcast throughout Western Europe and North America. I understand that it is being seen and heard as well in the East -- that Berlin television can be seen as far to the southeast as Leipzig, as far to the northeast as Gdansk; that Berlin radio can be picked up as far due east as Moscow.

To those listening throughout Eastern Europe, I extend my warmest greetings and the goodwill of the American people. To those listening in East Berlin, a special word. Although I cannot be with you, I address my remarks to you just as surely as to those standing here before me. For I join you as I join your fellow countrymen in the West in this firm, this unalterable belief: (S gippt nor ine Ber leen) Es gibt nur ein Berlin. [There is only one Berlin.]

Behind me stands a wall that divides the entire continent of Europe. From the Baltic south it cuts across Germany in one continuous gash of ~~barbed wire~~ barbed wire, guard towers, ~~dog runs~~, and gun emplacements. Farther south, there may be no visible, no obvious wall. But there remain armed guards and checkpoints all the same -- still a restriction on the right to travel, still an instrument to impose upon ordinary men and women the will of a totalitarian state.

Yet it is here in Berlin where the wall emerges most clearly; here, cutting across your city, where the newsphoto and the television screen have imprinted this brutal division of a continent upon the mind of the world. Standing before the Brandenburg Gate, any man is a German, separated from his fellow men. Any man is a Berliner, forced to look upon a scar.

~~President von Weizsäcker has said~~ The German question is open as long as the Brandenburg Gate is closed. Today I say: As long as this gate is closed, as long as this scar of a wall is permitted to stand, it is not the German question alone that remains open, but the question of freedom for all mankind.

with pictures
Varying -
pictures
making border
deeper - taking
away bigger
said

not use
name - he's
not active now
n. Williams
n. Frangos
Berlin
Ali Khan
Summer
man. Pol.
Dec 4/1984

did not
say
this
Sot in
trouble
before.

Farther to the west
X
Where

show

OK
Eberhard
Puttkamer
Slet
Quote
office
Fed. Pres.

Yet I do not come here to lament. For I find in Berlin a message of hope -- even, in the shadow of this wall, a message of triumph.

In this season of spring in 1945, the people of Berlin emerged from their air-raid shelters to find devastation. Thousands of miles away, the people of the United States reached out to help. *On 1947* In announcing the Marshall Plan, Secretary of State George Marshall stated precisely 40 years ago *month* *this week:* "Our policy is directed not against any country or doctrine, but against hunger, poverty, desperation, and chaos."

US Berlin-Memo
Tom Watson
Andrew
the
Jan.
In the Reichstag a few moments ago, I saw a display commemorating this 40th anniversary of the Marshall Plan. I was struck by the sign on a burnt-out, gutted structure that was being rebuilt. I understand that Berliners of my own generation can remember seeing signs like it dotted throughout the Western sectors of the city. The sign read simply: "The Marshall Plan *is helping here. To strengthen the* at work. ~~For the building of a~~ Free World."

"[T]he building of a Free World" -- in the West, that building took place. Japan rose from ruin to become an economic giant. Italy, France, Belgium -- virtually every nation in Western Europe saw political and economic rebirth. The European community was founded.

In West Germany and here in Berlin, there took place an economic miracle, the "Wirtschaftswunder." Adenauer, Erhard, Reuter, and other leaders understood the practical importance of liberty -- that just as truth can flourish only when the journalist is given freedom of speech, so prosperity can come

about only when the farmer and businessman enjoy economic freedom. The German leaders reduced tariffs, expanded free trade, lowered taxes. From 1950 to 1960 alone, the standard of living in West Germany and Berlin more than doubled.

Where four decades ago there was rubble, today in West Berlin there is the greatest industrial output of any city in Germany; busy office blocks; fine homes and apartments; proud avenues and the spreading lawns of parkland. Where a city's culture seemed to have been destroyed, today there are two great universities, orchestras and an opera, countless theaters and museums. Where there was want, today there is abundance -- food, clothing, automobiles; the wonderful goods of the Ku'damm; even home computers.

From devastation -- from utter ruin -- you Berliners have in freedom rebuilt a city that once again ranks as one of the greatest on Earth. The Soviets may have had other plans. But, my friends, there was one thing the Soviets didn't count on:

Ber leener hertz *Ber leener who more*
Berliner herz [Berlin heart] *Berliner humor* [Berlin humor].
Ja, und Berleener schinout *shin*
Ja, und Berliner schnauze [a favorite slang term meaning courage mixed with toughness -- an applause line].

In the ~~1960s~~ ¹⁹⁵⁶, Khrushchev predicted: "We will bury you." But in the West today, we see a free world that has achieved a level of prosperity and well-being unprecedented in all human history. In the Communist world, we see failure. Technological backwardness. Declining standards of health. Even want of the most basic kind -- too little food. The Soviet Union still cannot feed itself. (East Germany has made strides, but at

Quote about Antine West
 J. Waller
 USDO (State)
 Current Policy
 #905

Schiller
 US SW
 Quality of life
 into bulletin

E. Gurn has same
GMP as Eng.

E. Gurn is
very efficient
in English!

harvest time the news announcers (still speak) to use the well-known phrase, of "the battle to bring in the crops."

After these four ^{decades} decades, then, there stands before the entire world one great and inescapable conclusion. Freedom leads to prosperity. Freedom replaces the ancient hatreds between the nations with comity and peace.

Fry. height Fry height ist dare See. ger
Freiheit -- Freiheit ist der Sieger. [Freedom is the victor.]

X

Now the Soviets themselves may in a limited way be coming to understand the importance of freedom. We hear much from Moscow about a new policy of reform and openness. Some political prisoners have been released. Certain foreign news broadcasts are no longer being jammed. Some economic enterprises have been permitted to operate with greater freedom from state control.

Nelson

Are these the beginnings of profound changes in the Soviet state? Or are they token gestures, intended to raise false hopes in the West and to strengthen the Soviet system without changing it? We welcome change and openness. For we believe freedom and security go together -- that the advance of human liberty can only strengthen the cause of world peace. There is one sign the Soviets can make that would be unmistakable, that would advance dramatically the cause of freedom and peace.

General Secretary Gorbachev, if you seek peace -- if you seek prosperity for the Soviet Union and Eastern Europe -- if you seek liberalization: Come here, to this gate.

mā ken 2 desus tour alf

Herr Gorbachev, machen Sie dieses Tor auf. [Mr. Gorbachev, open this gate.]

X

Time
2/4/87
Official
Main St.
SN: it
775-9720
5/15/87
memo

Mr. Gorbachev, tear down this wall. [This line in English for the American audience.]

I understand the fear of war and the pain of division that afflict this continent -- and I pledge to you my country's efforts to help overcome these burdens. To be sure, we in the West must resist Soviet expansion. So we must maintain defenses of unassailable strength. Yet we seek peace. So we must strive to reduce arms on both sides.

Beginning 10 years ago, the Soviets challenged the Western Alliance with a grave new threat: hundreds of new and more deadly SS-20 nuclear missiles, capable of striking every capital in Europe. The Western Alliance responded by committing itself to a counter-deployment unless the Soviets agreed to negotiate a better solution -- namely, the elimination of such weapons on both sides. For many months, the Soviets refused to bargain in earnestness. As the Alliance in turn prepared to go forward with its counter-deployment, there were difficult days -- days of protests like those during my 1982 visit to this city -- and the Soviets actually walked away from the table.

But through it all, the Alliance held firm. And I invite those who protested then -- I invite those who protest today -- to mark this fact: Because we remained strong, the Soviets came back to the table. Because we remained strong, today we have within reach the possibility, not merely of limiting the growth of arms, but of eliminating, for the first time, an entire class of nuclear weapons from the face of the Earth.

Wrote
76-77
Steiner
Dec 79 - Nato
Sept 80
Dec 80
N. 81
Chomsky
Jan 82 at table
NW 1983
told out
back to table
March 85
Steve
Steiner
5697

As I speak, NATO ministers are meeting in Iceland to review the progress of our proposals for the complete elimination of intermediate-range nuclear forces. At the talks in Geneva, we have proposed deep cuts in strategic forces. And the Western Allies have likewise made far-reaching proposals to reduce the danger of conventional war, and to place a total ban on chemical weapons.

While we pursue these arms reductions, I pledge to you that we will maintain the capacity to deter Soviet aggression at any level at which it might occur. And in cooperation with many of our Allies, the United States is pursuing a Strategic Defense Initiative -- research that bases deterrence not on the threat of offensive retaliation, but on defenses that truly defend; on systems, in short, that will protect lives not by targeting populations but by shielding them.

By these means we seek to increase the safety of Europe and all the world. But we must remember a crucial fact: East and West do not mistrust each other because we are armed. We are armed because we mistrust each other. And our differences are not about weapons but about liberty. Perhaps when President Kennedy spoke at the City Hall those 24 years ago, it was freedom that was encircled, Berlin that was under siege. No longer. Despite all the pressures upon this city, Berlin stands secure in its liberty. And today freedom itself is transforming the globe.

In the Philippines; in South and Central America, democracy has been given a rebirth. Throughout the Pacific, free markets are working miracle after miracle of economic growth. In the

industrialized nations, a technological revolution is taking place -- a revolution marked by rapid, dramatic advances in computers and telecommunications.

In Europe, only one nation and those it controls refuse to join the community of freedom. Yet in this age of redoubled economic growth, of information and innovation, the Soviet Union faces a choice. It must make fundamental changes. Or it will become obsolete.

Today thus represents a moment of hope. We in the West stand ready to cooperate with the East to promote true openness -- to break down the barriers that separate people, to create a safer, freer world. And surely there is no better place than Berlin, the meetingplace of East and West, to make a start.

*RN Begins
10/24/71*

Free people of Berlin: Today, as in the past, the United States stands for the strict observance and full implementation of all parts of the Four-Power Agreement of 1971. Let us use this occasion, the 750th anniversary of this city, to usher in a new era -- to seek a still fuller, richer life for the Berlin of the future. Together, let us maintain and develop the ties between the Federal Republic and the Western sectors of Berlin, which is permitted by the 1971 Agreement.

And I invite Mr. Gorbachev: Let us work to bring the Eastern and Western parts of the city closer together, so that all the inhabitants of all Berlin can enjoy the benefits that should come with life in one of the great cities of the world.

To open Berlin still further to all Europe, East and West, let us expand the vital air access to this city, finding ways of

making commercial air service to Berlin through the established corridors more convenient, more comfortable, and more economical. We look to the day when West Berlin can become one of the chief aviation hubs in all Central Europe.

7
0 With our French, and British partners, the United States is prepared to ~~sponsor~~ ^{help bring} international meetings ~~in~~ ^{to} Berlin. It would be only fitting for Berlin to serve as the site of United Nations meetings, or world conferences on human rights and arms control or other issues that call for international cooperation.

0 There is no better way to establish hope for the future than to enlighten young minds, and we would be honored to sponsor summer youth exchanges, cultural events, and other programs for young Berliners from the East. Our French and British friends, I am certain, will do the same. And it is my hope that an authority can be found in East Berlin to sponsor visits from young people of the Western sectors.

One final proposal -- one close to my heart. Sport represents a source of enjoyment and ennoblement, and you may have noted that the Republic of Korea -- South Korea -- has offered to permit certain events of the 1988 Olympics to take place in the North. International sports competitions of all kinds could take place in both parts of this city. And what better way to demonstrate to the world the openness of this city -- than to offer in some future year to hold the Olympic Games here in Berlin, East and West?

In these four decades, as I have said, you Berliners have rebuilt a great city. You have done so in spite of threats: The

Soviet attempts to impose the East-mark. The blockade. Today the city thrives in spite of the challenges implicit in the very presence of this wall.

? What keeps you here?

0 Certainly there is a great deal to be said for your fortitude, for your defiant courage. But I believe that there is something deeper. Something that involves Berlin's whole look and feel and way of life. Not mere sentiment -- no one could live long in Berlin without being completely disabused of illusions. Something instead that sees the difficulties of life in Berlin but chooses to accept them. That stubbornly refuses to abandon this good and proud city to a surrounding presence that is merely brutish. Something that speaks with a powerful voice of affirmation -- that says yes to this city, yes to the future, yes to freedom. In a word, I would submit that what keeps you in Berlin is love -- love both profound and abiding.

Perhaps this gets to the root of the matter, to the most fundamental distinction of all between East and West. The totalitarian world does not produce low living standards and backwardness because of some technical shortcoming in its economic arrangements. It produces backwardness because it does such violence to the spirit, thwarting the human impulse to create, to enjoy, to worship.

The totalitarian world finds even symbols of love an affront. During the War, the sculpture atop the Brandenburg Gate was ~~taken down for safekeeping and stored here, in the Western sectors of the city.~~ destroyed the late fifties the sculpture was recast In ~~the~~ the late fifties, the West turned the sculpture over

plaster mold stored of original 1958

destroyed in war - recast in W. Berlin in 56-57 based on orig. mold

298 4246
U. from Emb.
298-4000
Dr. Wles
Spicenberg

quadrige

a put up wreck.

(brackets)

Gate built 1791
quadriga - 1794 - just wreath
1814 came to Berlin
w/ restoration &

to the East in a gesture of (goodwill) and soon the sculpture was
(On ta den Linden) once again looking out upon "Unter den Linden" [the main avenue
in East Berlin]. But something was different. The cross -- the
cross the figure had borne aloft for nearly 150 years -- that
cross was gone. In its place was a (Communist) wreath.

1969 some 10 years later, authorities in the East erected what is now
the tallest structure in the city, the television tower above
Alexanderplatz. I understand that virtually ever since, the
authorities have been working to correct what they view as the
tower's one major flaw, treating the glass ~~done~~ sphere at the top with
paints and chemicals of every kind. Yet even today when the sun
strikes that ~~come~~ sphere -- that ~~come~~ sphere that towers over all Berlin -- the
light makes the sign of the cross.

As I looked out a moment ago from the Reichstag -- that
embodiment of German unity -- I noticed words crudely
spray-painted upon the wall -- perhaps by a young Berliner --
words that answer the German question. "This wall will fall.
Beliefs become reality."

Yes, across Europe, this wall will fall. For it cannot
withstand faith. It cannot withstand truth.
Die Mauer kann Freiheit nicht zuruckhalten. [The wall
cannot withstand freedom.]

Thank you. God bless you all.

1957
1814
143

X

?

4-Power
cross &
leg removed
& orig. recast
wreath put
back.

1969

Mr. Williams
(Mission)
sphere on
top of pencil
in bubble

Don't
think
it's
possible
for
him to
see

Dee Maer kann Freyheit nicht sir ook hall ten
Die Mauer kann Freiheit nicht zuruckhalten.

attention to
the high pro-
such social
and drunk-

both parts
dings. Each
ent districts,
t ambitious.
itect Walter
le in 17,000
ors. A sub-
ed to permit
to East Ber-
d. City plan-
eventual re-
buildings will

the new with
n, the 1957
he pregnant
and the re-
100,000,000
; also signifi-
-hall (Philhar-
dern art (Na-
itect Ludwig
st worked in
complex also
from the war
hotels, and a
near the new
iskirche (Me-
main tower

l and church
the Nikolai-
ted by bomb-
ding as a re-
ever, is domi-
great postwar
re) television
and has a re-
because it had
ver represents
Germans as a

adjacent to a

Berlin Funk—Ullstein



Alexander Platz, meeting point of Karl-Marx-Allee and Lenin-Allee, two main avenues in East Berlin.
Siegfried Sammer—Bavaria Verlag

refashioned Alexander Platz. This square, once a cross-roads of Greater Berlin, leads to the 1952 Stalin-Allee, a postwar housing project where the revolt of 1953 began; it was renamed Karl-Marx-Allee after Stalin's death. The 40-floor City of Berlin Hotel on Alexander Platz is Berlin's tallest business or residential building.

Unter den Linden also combines old and new, featuring modern hotels and shops along with the restored Zeughaus (Armoury), Neue Wache (New Watch), Crown Prince Palace, Prinzessinnenpalais (Princess Palace), State Opera, Old Library, Kaiser Wilhelm Palace and University, renamed after its founder, Humboldt. The Brandenburg Gate regained its sculptured chariot with four horses abreast in 1959, re-created after a model in West Berlin. At the head of the boulevard lies the great blackened mass of the Berlin Cathedral (Berliner Dom), which has not been rebuilt. Nearby stands Berlin's oldest remaining church, the Marienkirche, and also the so-called museum island with the Old (Altes) and New (Neues) museums, National Gallery (National-Galerie) and Pergamon Museum, containing, among other treasures from Pergamon, the altar of Zeus. In the area where the royal palace once stood are grouped the traditional red brick city hall, a foreign ministry, State Council Building, and the rebuilt St. Hedwig's Cathedral, Berlin's first Roman Catholic church to be put up after the Reformation. South of Unter den Linden is the old Gendarme Market, renamed Academy Square, once one of the finest architectural centres in Berlin, where restoration has begun of the twin German and French cathedrals and the State Theatre. The Wilhelmstrasse, seat of Prussian and Reich governments, has mostly gone. On one side lies the wall, Hitler's bunker, now covered by a grassy mound, and the empty Potsdamer Platz; on the other, the Nazi propaganda ministry of Joseph Goebbels still stands, taken over for Communist use. The marble from Hitler's nearby Reich Chancellery was used by the Russians for their war memorial just inside West Berlin.

Economy, administration, and social services. *Economic life.* To a large extent, traditional economic activities have been revived throughout Greater Berlin. These include textiles, ironworks and steelworks, rail cars, sewing machines, chemicals, china, breweries, and machine works. Electronics production is a principal industry in both East and West, and each is a fashion centre, as before the war. West Berlin has developed cigarette production as a vital industry. Bicycles from East Berlin have formed a substantial element of war aid to North Vietnam. Berlin continues to be a central and chief market for wheat, rye, and cereals from nearby and from farther east. This trade is channelled largely through East Berlin, since West Berlin is isolated from its hinterland.

East Berlin authorities try to maintain morale through cheaper basic elements in the cost of living, particularly

in accommodation rents and foodstuffs such as bread and potatoes. But shortages keep prices high for such items as automobiles, refrigerators, washing machines, and colour television sets. Salaries are lower than in the West, but comparative buying power is difficult to assess.

Administration. In the East and West separately, district government after World War II has continued much as before: with chief burgomaster, or mayor, city assembly, or parliament, and district mayors and councils, although a trend toward centralization runs strongly in such matters as citywide integration of education. On the higher level, subordination is the rule in East and West. In the East this results from its status as capital of East Germany. The chief burgomaster runs East Berlin through a city parliament but is overshadowed by the presence of the apparatus of the central Communist regime, including the Volkskammer (People's Chamber). East Berlin delegates to this body have something of a reduced position because the system of four-power responsibility is still kept alive, notably concerning free access to East Berlin for members of the western military garrisons. West Berlin being accounted the 11th *Land* of the German Federal Republic, its city parliament elects 22 delegates to the West German Bundestag (federal parliament) in Bonn but without full voting powers since the *Land* Berlin is not yet constitutionally part of the German Federal Republic, retaining occupied status. The U.S., British, and French commandants retain ultimate authority in their respective sectors. Soviet four-power participation continues at an air-safety centre for western flights to and from the city. The western commandants also have final say over police matters within their sectors. A 15,000-man West Berlin force includes large elements of paramilitary police who form an adjunct to the western garrisons and total about 12,000 men: this arrangement reflects the highly ambiguous condition within what was to have become a demilitarized Berlin under military occupation after the war.

Direct remilitarization by Germans is apparent only in East Berlin, however. The West German Bundeswehr (Federal Defense Force) is barred from the city, and its residents can volunteer for military service but are not liable to draft. East Germany openly drafts East Berliners, keeps garrisons for units of the People's Army within the city, and maintains a ring of 14,000 men in three brigades along the wall. Recruits are sworn in at public ceremonies, a weekly changing of the guard is staged with Prussian pomp and ceremony on Unter den Linden, and each May Day the People's Army parades in force. Allied protests are ignored. The Russians also maintain a Berlin garrison, with some 50,000 more men ringed about Greater Berlin.

Politics. East Berlin political parties are identical with those of East Germany, as is true of West Berlin and West Germany. The Socialist Unity (Communist) Party takes a commanding position in a National Front, comprising remnants of Social Democrats, Christian Democrats, Liberals, and nationalist groupings. The Social Democrats have kept control of the West Berlin city government from the days of Lord Mayor Ernst Reuter, with the Christian Democrats the second largest party, followed by the Free Democrats. There also is a small West Berlin Communist Party.

Justice. In matters of justice, East Berlin is fully integrated within an overall East German court system. In West Berlin, the presence of the West German Constitutional Court is barred because of Allied reservations. In practical law, however, West German justice and legislation apply under the federal constitution as they do under the East German constitution in East Berlin.

Health and education. Far-reaching health insurance is available throughout the city, which once again forms Germany's largest centre of medical activity. In East Berlin, the Charité has resumed its pivotal role, first taken up as a royal hospital on its foundation in 1710. In West Berlin, a modern Klinikum, or teaching hospital, has introduced new methods to medical practice.

Berlin has traditionally played a leading role in German education, which in the postwar West has been pursued

Subor-
nate r
of city
parlia-
ments



MISSION
OF THE
UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

MEMORANDUM

June 3, 1987

TO: White House Advance: Andrew Littlefair
FROM: USABER: James A. Williams
SUBJECT: Factual Questions on Berlin
REFERENCE: Your Phone Query of June 2, 1987

1. Quadriga. In 1791 the Brandenburg Gate, a copy of the Propyläen Gate from Athens, was dedicated. In 1794 the Quadriga, the horse-drawn chariot with the goddess Victory, was set in place above the arch. The goddess originally held a wreath aloft in her right hand. Napoleon took the Quadriga to Paris in 1806; it came back to Berlin in 1814. During restoration in the nineteenth century, a Maltese cross and Prussian crown were added to the wreath.

The Quadriga has always faced eastward. It was largely destroyed in World War II. In 1956-57 the Quadriga was recast at the U. S. Hoack Foundry in West Berlin. Although the rededication and remounting of the Quadriga were meant to be an inter-allied affair, the Soviets unilaterally removed the Maltese Cross and Prussian Crown before placing the new Quadriga above the Brandenburg Gate.

2. Pope's Revenge. When the sun shines on the TV tower in East Berlin, a cross appears on the side of the metal "bubble". That cross, called "the Pope's revenge," can be seen for miles in all Berlin. Designed in 1959, the tower was built in 1965-1969 and officially opened on October 3, 1969 (the 20th anniversary of East Germany). It is 365 meters tall. East German authorities have never been able to alter the surface of the bubble to eliminate the sun's glint in the shape of a cross.

3. Berliner Dialect. Citing the "Berliner Schnauze und mit Herz" is definitely a positive thing and would be well-received in a Presidential speech. "Schnauze" here means plain-speaking, openness, and directness.

4. Who Said That? Contrary to widespread impression (including mine -- sorry about that!), President Richard von Weizsaecker did not say that "the German question is open so long as the Brandenburg Gate is closed." We are trying to find out the true source of that quotation.

5. Biography. I attach a short bio sheet on Captain Jack Bennett.

Attachment: a/s

UNCLASSIFIED
CLASSIFICATION

CIRCLE ONE BELOW

IMMEDIATE

PRIORITY

ROUTINE

MODE

SECURE FAX # 11

ADMIN FAX #

RECORD #

PAGES 2

DTG 031600Z

RELEASER

FROM/LOCATION

1. Littlefair / WEST BERLIN

TO/LOCATION/TIME OF RECEIPT

1. Theresa ROSEN BURGER / SPEECHWRITING EXT 7750

2. TOR - 031600Z

INFORMATION ADDRESSES/LOCATION/TIME OF RECEIPT

1.

2.

WHITE HOUSE
87 JUN 3 12 22 PM '87
SITUATION ROOM

SPECIAL INSTRUCTIONS/REMARKS:

Please NOTIFY UPON RECEIPT.

Thank you.

UNCLASSIFIED
CLASSIFICATION

Encyclopedia
Britannica
Vol #2

few, with only one major station in West Berlin. Subway construction began in 1897, and by World War II the city possessed one of the finest systems in Europe, consisting of 92 stations forming a net stretching 46.6 miles. Administration was divided between East and West in 1948. Western additions increased the total to 55.9 miles, with East Berlin adding 14.9 miles.

Air traffic has played an important role from 1945, particularly in the West, a role increased in importance at the time of the airlift. Tempelhof provides a midcity field for West Berlin with Tegel, the site of early rocket launches, furnishing an extensive auxiliary field for large jets. East Berlin's Schönefeld also accommodates the largest aircraft.

Only planes of the United States, Great Britain, and France are able to use the air corridors to the West. The East German line, Interflug, uses Schönefeld mostly for eastwardly traffic. By the early 1970s, however, each half of the city was seeking a broader air traffic program that would take advantage of Berlin's natural east-west and north-south axis for traffic across Europe in every direction.

The Reichsautobahn (National Expressway) in Berlin is the Berlin terminus of a superhighway net developed before World War II that covers Germany. West Berlin has built a crosstown extension and northern and southern interchanges. The whole and East Berlin's main traffic arteries are linked with the Berliner Ring, a circle of Autobahn connecting road around the city, putting Berlin in the centre of access spokes.

Demography. Two Berlin half-cities virtually equal in area emerged from the 1945 division into four occupation sectors. Of the 20 metropolitan districts the Soviet Union took the eight eastern ones, while the Americans took six, the British four, and the French two of the 12 in the West. From the time Greater Berlin unified itself under metropolitan administration in 1920, an overall expanse of 339 square miles (878 square kilometres) increased slightly so that now West Berlin comprises 185 square miles (480 square kilometres) and East Berlin 156 square miles (403 square kilometres), a total of 341 square miles (883 square kilometres).

The population of West Berlin in 1970 was over 2,000,000 and of East Berlin a little over 1,000,000. Some 800,000 people living in the West had close relatives in the East. A modest quarter-century increase from 2,800,000 in the whole city at the end of World War II still represented a considerable drop from more than 4,300,000 in 1939. The erection of modern buildings and the restoration of historic ones has made Greater Berlin, with broad, bustling streets in each half, retain its position as the largest German city anywhere. It also retains its role as Germany's greatest population centre, once sixth and now 16th among the 20 largest cities in the world, and reclaims its functions as the centre of German culture, technology, medicine, and industrial enterprise, despite its political fragmentation.

The unitary character of Greater Berlin is illustrated in the age structure of its population. As the city moved into the final third of the 20th century, one-fifth of its inhabitants were over 65 years old. Although the forecast of West Berlin deaths remained fixed at about 40,000 annually, birth rate projections indicated a drop of from 22,419 in 1970 to 17,578 by 1978. If so, West Berlin's population would fall below 2,000,000 by 1980. In essence, the city never recovered from a low rate of 8.6 births per thousand in 1944 and the high of 55.5 deaths per thousand in the collapse of 1945. At the beginning of the war the birth rate was 17.2 compared with a death rate of 13.2. For 1969, East Berlin registered 3.1 less births than deaths per thousand, while West Berlin had 9.8 less.

West Berlin managed to even out its death losses with an inflow of about 30,000 West German workers per year. Likewise East Germany had a backlog of workers wanting to move to East Berlin. Each side began employing foreign workers, with the figure in West Berlin rising above 100,000 by 1970. In East and West, more than two children per family was highly unusual, since young

couples in their family planning paid close attention to schooling, housing, and job opportunities. The high proportion of elderly persons contributed to such social problems, aggravated by loneliness, as suicide and drunkenness.

Housing. Emphasis on new construction in both parts of Berlin has been in housing and office buildings. Each side has built clusters of new high-rise apartment districts, with the Gropiusstadt of the West the most ambitious. Named after its designer, Berlin-born architect Walter Gropius (1883-1969), it houses 50,000 people in 17,000 apartments, the tallest building rising 31 floors. A subway line and Autobahn have been so planned to permit extension beyond the nearby wall boundary to East Berlin's Schönefeld airfield lying in view beyond. City planners in East and West continue to consider eventual reunion so that new streets will fit and new buildings will mesh within a single concept.

Architectural features. An effort to blend the new with the traditional is evident. In West Berlin, the 1957 Congress Hall (Kongress Halle; called "the pregnant oyster" by Berliners, because of its shape) and the restored Reichstag building, rebuilt at a cost of 100,000,000 Deutsche Marks, are examples of this trend; also significant are the 1963 Philharmonic Concert Hall (Philharmonie) and a new National Gallery of modern art (Nationalgalerie), the last creation of the architect Ludwig Mies van der Rohe (1886-1969), who first worked in Berlin before World War I. This western complex also includes the Victory Column (Siegessäule) from the wars of 1864-70, Schloss Bellevue (castle), new hotels, and a 20-story glass and steel Europa Centre near the new buildings of the Kaiser Wilhelm-Gedächtniskirche (Memorial Church), whose original blackened main tower has been left as a war memorial.

East Berlin also has its own new symbol and church war memorial. Berlin's oldest building, the Nikolai-Kirche, dating from around 1200, was gutted by bombing, and its red brick walls were left standing as a reminder. The central East Berlin area, however, is dominated by the Communist regime's first great postwar prestige project, a 1,170-foot (357-metre) television tower. It commands the Berlin landscape and has a revolving restaurant at the 800-foot level. Because it had to be erected on Berlin's sandy soil, the tower represents an engineering feat and is seen by East Germans as a symbol of their capital.

The tower, completed in 1969, stands adjacent to a

Ball
in the

Berlin's
role in
German
life

Berlin Funk-Ullstein



The new memorial church built next to the ruined Kaiser Wilhelm Memorial Church, West Berlin.



Alexander Platz, meeting point of Karl-Marx-Allee and Lenin-Allee, two main avenues in East Berlin.
Siegfried Sammer—Bavaria Verlag

refashioned Alexander Platz. This square, once a crossroads of Greater Berlin, leads to the 1952 Stalin-Allee, a postwar housing project where the revolt of 1953 began; it was renamed Karl-Marx-Allee after Stalin's death. The 40-floor City of Berlin Hotel on Alexander Platz is Berlin's tallest business or residential building.

Unter den Linden also combines old and new, featuring modern hotels and shops along with the restored Zeughaus (Armoury), Neue Wache (New Watch), Crown Prince Palace, Prinzessinnenpalais (Princess Palace), State Opera, Old Library, Kaiser Wilhelm Palace and University, renamed after its founder, Humboldt. The Brandenburg Gate regained its sculptured chariot with four horses abreast in 1959, re-created after a model in West Berlin. At the head of the boulevard lies the great blackened mass of the Berlin Cathedral (Berliner Dom), which has not been rebuilt. Nearby stands Berlin's oldest remaining church, the Marienkirche, and also the so-called museum island with the Old (Altes) and New (Neues) museums, National Gallery (National-Galerie) and Pergamon Museum, containing, among other treasures from Pergamon, the altar of Zeus. In the area where the royal palace once stood are grouped the traditional red brick city hall, a foreign ministry, State Council Building, and the rebuilt St. Hedwig's Cathedral, Berlin's first Roman Catholic church to be put up after the Reformation. South of Unter den Linden is the old Gendarme Market, renamed Academy Square, once one of the finest architectural centres in Berlin, where restoration has begun of the twin German and French cathedrals and the State Theatre. The Wilhelmstrasse, seat of Prussian and Reich governments, has mostly gone. On one side lies the wall, Hitler's bunker, now covered by a grassy mound, and the empty Potsdamer Platz; on the other, the Nazi propaganda ministry of Joseph Goebbels still stands, taken over for Communist use. The marble from Hitler's nearby Reich Chancellery was used by the Russians for their war memorial just inside West Berlin.

Economy, administration, and social services. *Economic life.* To a large extent, traditional economic activities have been revived throughout Greater Berlin. These include textiles, ironworks and steelworks, rail cars, sewing machines, chemicals, china, breweries, and machine works. Electronics production is a principal industry in both East and West, and each is a fashion centre, as before the war. West Berlin has developed cigarette production as a vital industry. Bicycles from East Berlin have formed a substantial element of war aid to North Vietnam. Berlin continues to be a central and chief market for wheat, rye, and cereals from nearby and from farther east. This trade is channelled largely through East Berlin, since West Berlin is isolated from its hinterland.

East Berlin authorities try to maintain morale through cheaper basic elements in the cost of living, particularly

in accommodation rents and foodstuffs such as bread and potatoes. But shortages keep prices high for such items as automobiles, refrigerators, washing machines, and colour television sets. Salaries are lower than in the West, but comparative buying power is difficult to assess.

Administration. In the East and West separately, district government after World War II has continued much as before: with chief burgomaster, or mayor, city assembly, or parliament, and district mayors and councils, although a trend toward centralization runs strongly in such matters as citywide integration of education. On the higher level, subordination is the rule in East and West. In the East this results from its status as capital of East Germany. The chief burgomaster runs East Berlin through a city parliament but is overshadowed by the presence of the apparatus of the central Communist regime, including the Volkskammer (People's Chamber). East Berlin delegates to this body have something of a reduced position because the system of four-power responsibility is still kept alive, notably concerning free access to East Berlin for members of the western military garrisons. West Berlin being accounted the 11th Land of the German Federal Republic, its city parliament elects 22 delegates to the West German Bundestag (federal parliament) in Bonn but without full voting powers since the Land Berlin is not yet constitutionally part of the German Federal Republic, retaining occupied status. The U.S., British, and French commandants retain ultimate authority in their respective sectors. Soviet four-power participation continues at an air-safety centre for western flights to and from the city. The western commandants also have final say over police matters within their sectors. A 15,000-man West Berlin force includes large elements of paramilitary police who form an adjunct to the western garrisons and total about 12,000 men: this arrangement reflects the highly ambiguous condition with-in what was to have become a demilitarized Berlin under military occupation after the war.

Direct remilitarization by Germans is apparent only in East Berlin, however. The West German Bundeswehr (Federal Defense Force) is barred from the city, and its residents can volunteer for military service but are not liable to draft. East Germany openly drafts East Berliners, keeps garrisons for units of the People's Army within the city, and maintains a ring of 14,000 men in three brigades along the wall. Recruits are sworn in at public ceremonies, a weekly changing of the guard is staged with Prussian pomp and ceremony on Unter den Linden, and each May Day the People's Army parades in force. Allied protests are ignored. The Russians also maintain a Berlin garrison, with some 50,000 more men ringed about Greater Berlin.

Politics. East Berlin political parties are identical with those of East Germany, as is true of West Berlin and West Germany. The Socialist Unity (Communist) Party takes a commanding position in a National Front, comprising remnants of Social Democrats, Christian Democrats, Liberals, and nationalist groupings. The Social Democrats have kept control of the West Berlin city government from the days of Lord Mayor Ernst Reuter, with the Christian Democrats the second largest party, followed by the Free Democrats. There also is a small West Berlin Communist Party.

Justice. In matters of justice, East Berlin is fully integrated within an overall East German court system. In West Berlin, the presence of the West German Constitutional Court is barred because of Allied reservations. In practical law, however, West German justice and legislation apply under the federal constitution as they do under the East German constitution in East Berlin.

Health and education. Far-reaching health insurance is available throughout the city, which once again forms Germany's largest centre of medical activity. In East Berlin, the Charité has resumed its pivotal role, first taken up as a royal hospital on its foundation in 1710. In West Berlin, a modern Klinikum, or teaching hospital, has introduced new methods to medical practice.

Berlin has traditionally played a leading role in German education, which in the postwar West has been pursued

Subordinate role of city parliaments

U.S.-Soviet Quality of Life: A Comparison

by Richard Schifter

Address before the Human Rights Experts' Meeting of the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe (CSCE) in Ottawa, Canada, on May 22, 1985. Ambassador Schifter is head of the U.S. delegation to the CSCE.

Ever since this conference began, we have returned, from time to time, to a discussion of what is perceived to be the distinction between political and civil rights on one hand and economic and social rights on the other hand. I shall, therefore, at the outset of this statement, set forth the thoughts of the U.S. delegation on this issue.

Rights of the Individual

Those of us who trace our views of government to the writings of the English and French thinkers of the 18th-century Enlightenment subscribe to the proposition that government derives its mandate from the consent of the governed, such consent being expressed in free elections. The government, thus, reflects the will of the majority. In this context of majority rule, the philosophers on the subject defined certain rights of the individual which are so basic that no government may deprive him of them, irrespective of the size of the popular majority by which it was installed in office. These rights of the individual are what we understand principally under the term "human rights." They define and clarify the fundamental relationship between the individual and his government, and they consist, essentially, of limitations on the powers of government. Like the biblical "Thou shalt not," the beginning phrase of the first amendment to the U.S. Constitution, the beginning phrase of our Bill of Rights, is "Congress shall make no law"—a phrase followed by the subjects on which Congress shall make no law, such as abridgment of freedom of speech or the press.

When we use the term "right," we think of a claim which can be enforced in the courts. The rights guaranteed in the U.S. Constitution, which in CSCE terminology are referred to as political and civil rights, are rights which every citizen can call upon the courts to protect.

We view what are here referred to as economic and social rights as belonging in an essentially different category.

They are, as we see it, the goals of government policy in domestic affairs. Government, as we see it, should foster policies which will have the effect of encouraging economic development so as to provide jobs under decent working conditions for all those who want to work at income levels which allow for an adequate standard of living. These goals should be attained in a setting which allows freedom of choice of his work to everyone. For those who are unable to find jobs we provide unemployment compensation and, if that is unavailable, other forms of social assistance. The economic system which is now in place in our country is fully in keeping with the relevant articles of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights.

The U.S. delegation, in selecting issues for discussion at this conference, decided deliberately to limit itself to problems which, though of great concern to the American public, would not require systemic changes in the Soviet Union to effect correction. Every one of the problems we have raised so far about conditions in countries which describe themselves as Marxist-Leninist could be eliminated while staying within the system.

It so happens, therefore, that the Soviet human rights problems of greatest concern to the American public are the problems which could be most easily solved by the Soviet Union. They concern, as we have pointed out, the incarceration of persons guilty only of giving expression to their thoughts, the persecution of religious believers, the commitment of sane persons to institutions for the mentally ill, cultural repression, and discrimination against certain people on the grounds of ancestry. The Soviet State could, as I have said, correct these problems without effecting fundamental structural change.

We had not intended to engage in discussions of economic and social conditions in the Soviet Union, both because the American public is not as deeply aware of or concerned about them and because correction of any shortcomings which we would have to point out would, indeed, require systemic change in the Soviet Union. We see such changes occurring gradually in some other countries which had initially adopted the Soviet economic model. However, we did not think this meeting to be an appropriate forum for a discussion of such issues. Nevertheless, as the Soviet delegation has clearly insisted that we engage in a discussion of social and

economic issues, let me say that we are prepared to join in that debate. To begin with, I shall respond in detail to the concerns expressed by the Soviet delegation as to social and economic problems in the United States.

U.S. Social and Economic Problems

Unemployment. First of all, let me discuss the problem of unemployment in the United States. Our present unemployment rate is 7.3%. It reached a peak of 10.5% in 1982 and has declined significantly since then. Millions of new jobs have been created in recent years, offering new opportunities to the unemployed as well as to persons newly entering the job market. While we agree that an unemployment rate of 7.3% is still too high and further efforts need to be made to reduce the unemployment level, we believe that any person analyzing our unemployment rate should note the following:

- About two percentage points are attributable to so-called frictional unemployment, i.e., persons in transit from one job to another.
- A significant number of the job opportunities which are available in the United States at any one time go unfilled because no one in the locality in which the jobs are available is interested in doing the kind of work available at the wages which are being offered; as we don't have a system under which people can be compelled to work, unfilled jobs thus exist side by side with unemployment.
- We do not have an anti-parasitism law; some persons prefer to draw unemployment insurance payments or welfare benefits rather than take jobs which they deem unsuitable.

- The percentage of our adult population looking for work in the productive sector of the economy is enlarged by the fact that we have significantly fewer people than the Soviet Union in our military forces, in our police forces, and, for that matter, in prison or performing forced labor; specifically, though the Soviet population is only 12% greater than that of the United States, its military forces are almost 200% greater, its police forces more than 100% greater, and its prison population, including forced labor, over 1,100% greater than the corresponding figures in the United States.

I have made these points only to explain what the 7.3% figure means, not to suggest that it can and should be ignored. Our government is committed to the proposition that everyone who wants

to work should have an opportunity to do so. Government policy is dedicated to the stimulation of economic growth, to the creation of more jobs, to the raising of standards of living, to the reduction of poverty. In a country such as ours, there is often disagreement as to what might be the best policy to effect economic growth. Different political groupings advocate different solutions to the problems we face. But there is an overwhelming consensus that unemployment must be reduced and that it should be reduced within our present economic framework.

When we compare our economic model to alternate approaches, we must note that, to some extent, unemployment in our country is a consequence of our ideas of individual freedom. We do not assign people to jobs or prosecute them for parasitism if they fail to take an available job. As I have noted, there are people in our country who pass up job opportunities because they don't like the jobs that are being offered or consider the wage offers too low. There are others who are unemployed and might be able to get a job of their liking and at a satisfactory wage at a substantial distance from their home, but they are loathe to move.

Much of the latter kind of unemployment is created by the fact that the economy adapts itself to market conditions. Uneconomic enterprises are thus compelled to close, sometimes causing serious dislocation in the communities dependent on them. In the long run, such adjustments enable the economy to adapt itself to change and to increase its overall productivity. But in the short run, it creates serious hardships for the people directly and adversely affected. To deal with these hardships and to bridge the periods of difficulty is a continuing challenge to our Federal, State, and local governments. We recognize it for the problem it is and seek to deal with it. For reasons which I shall state later, the overwhelming majority of our people are not at all attracted to the solution to this problem which the Soviet Union offers.

There is one other point that needs to be made with regard to the issue of employment. We need to emphasize the role which a free labor movement has played in the United States in strengthening the role of the worker, achieving increases in wages and improvements in working conditions. The existence of a free labor movement, accountable only to its members and not under the control of employers or governments, is, we believe, essential to the protection of the

interests of working people. It has succeeded in the United States in setting standards not only for its own members but for unorganized workers as well. As I noted yesterday, workers in certain states which profess to have been founded for the benefit of the working people are deprived of the ability to assert their interests through the operation of free and independent labor unions.

Homelessness. The distinguished Soviet representative has raised the issue of homelessness in the United States. We recognize the existence of homelessness in our society. This is a complex and difficult problem for us, in large part because in recent years our laws have not allowed us to incarcerate or commit to mental institutions persons who insist on living on the sidewalks of our cities as long as they are not threats to themselves or society. Many of these people refuse to make use of the wide range of accommodations available to them. In some societies they would be charged with vagrancy, parasitism, or forced into mental institutions. In our cities they remain on the streets, quite understandably causing many visitors to wonder whether there is, in fact, no housing available for them.

The fact is that our Federal Government and our State governments have spent and continue to spend hundreds of millions of dollars to provide shelter for the homeless. Those who cannot be self-sufficient, such as the elderly, are given priority in assistance programs. Furthermore, the tradition of voluntarism in the United States has resulted in the creation of a great number of nonprofit groups which have specialized in helping those in need of what our laws call safe and sanitary housing. Particular efforts have been made to assist the elderly.

I should also make it clear that there are quite a number of people in our country who live in housing which we deem substandard. We are interested in improving such housing, though we know that what is substandard in the United States may be standard in countries which are among our severest critics.

Discrimination. We readily concede that persons were for a long time discriminated against in our country on the grounds of their ancestry, and we recognize that government at all levels shares culpability with regard to this problem. However, beginning 40 years ago, policies on the subject of race began to change in our country and have changed at an ever-accelerating pace. Over this period the Federal Government as well

as State and local governments have succeeded in stamping out all officially sanctioned forms of discrimination based on ancestry. Beyond that, laws have been enacted that require the private sector to conform to fundamental principles of nondiscrimination.

What I have just said does not mean that we can overnight overcome the results of generations of discrimination and disadvantage. I have not carefully checked all the statistics which our distinguished Soviet colleague has recited, but they may very well be correct. What is important to note is the change in the figures in recent years, as groups of our population which were previously discriminated against have seen the barriers fall and have used the opportunities which have been afforded them.

Nothing that I have said is designed to suggest that we have eliminated racial and ethnic antagonisms within our population. They do exist, and government is not able to change that fact. But here, too, we have witnessed change. Through the activities of various institutions—including, particularly, religious organizations—younger people have increasingly been imbued with a commitment to human brotherhood. We, therefore, have reason to believe that over time these antagonisms will continue to diminish.

My remarks about nondiscrimination generally apply to Indians as well. But our Indian people have a special problem, which they share with indigenous peoples elsewhere in the world—indigenous peoples whose culture and economies differ markedly from those of the surrounding society. Many of our Indian reservation residents are only a few generations removed from a hunting and fishing culture. They have found it much more difficult to fit into industrial society than do the descendants of families engaged in agriculture.

The unusually large unemployment rate on Indian reservations is related to this problem. It is, let me emphasize, the unemployment rate not of Indian people but for Indian reservations. Indian people who have decided to leave the reservations can find and have found jobs elsewhere in the country. But there is no doubt that Indian reservations have found it difficult to attract industry and thereby create job opportunities for Indian people at reasonable wage levels in their home communities. It happens to be a problem with which our government has concerned itself and continues to concern itself. I readily concede that the problem has not been solved. In fact, I have personally worked and written on this subject.

I shall complete this discussion of discrimination by noting again that the United States has served as a magnet for immigrants of all races to achieve a higher standard of life for themselves and for their children. The fact that a majority of recent immigrants to the United States are nonwhites from non-European areas and that they have integrated into our society at a truly amazing speed is clear evidence of the strength of the well-recognized American acceptance of a variety of ethnic groups into our social and economic system.

The Role of Women. Much has also been said here as to the role of women in the United States. As to the point made concerning the Equal Rights Amendment, let me note again that the courts of the United States have construed the 5th and 14th amendments to the U.S. Constitution so as to require legal equality between the sexes.

Admittedly, what is required by law takes time to be translated into reality in day-to-day life. The entry of women into our economic life on a basis of parity occurred only quite recently, after 1970. It has, however, progressed at amazing speed. To cite one item of statistics that comes to mind, in 1970, 2% of all law school students were women. Today they are 50%.

But new entries do not come in at the very top. That is why we find average women's wages to be below the average earned by men. It was 60% in 1980; it is 64% today and is expected to continue to rise as the years go by. Here, too, we do not suggest that we have reached our goal of full actual rather than purely legal equality, but we are clearly on our way toward that goal.

Soviet Economic Progress Since the October Revolution

As I said earlier, we had not intended to engage here in a debate on the respective advantages of the U.S. and Soviet models, but as the Soviet Union has initiated this discussion, we want to make it clear that we are not inclined to shrink from it. Let me say also that we recognize that the Soviet Union started to industrialize later than we did and that the Soviet Union suffered devastation during World Wars I and II. But let us also remember that we recalled earlier in this session that the war in Europe ended 40 years ago. How far has the Soviet Union been able to travel in this period on the way to its economic goals?

In the early 1960s, Nikita Khrushchev predicted that the Soviet Union would surpass the United States in living standards by 1980. Yet studies of comparative per capita consumption conducted by University of Virginia professor Gertrude Schroeder and others show that today, 25 years after Khrushchev spoke and 67 years after the October Revolution, the Soviet standard of living remains barely one-third of the U.S. level. These same studies show that Soviet living standards are much lower than in any developed Western country.

The average Soviet citizen, in fact, lives less well than someone living at the official U.S. poverty line. An American family living at that level, for example, lives on an income which is 41% of the U.S. average. About 15.2% of our population lives at or below that level. By comparison, as indicated, the average Soviet citizen lives at about one-third of the U.S. average, which gives us some idea of the percentage of the Soviet population which lives below the U.S. poverty line. As suggested earlier by our distinguished Spanish colleague, equally dramatic comparisons can be made between the average Soviet citizen and the average unemployed worker in the West. In the recession year of 1982, for example—the worst since World War II—the median per capita income for unemployed workers in the United States was about \$5,000. The average income of a family with an unemployed worker was \$20,000. We do not deny that such an income in many cases reflected a substantial decline in living standards. But a Soviet family living on the equivalent of \$20,000 a year would be quite well off, even after we have adjusted for differences in the cost of basic needs.

In making these comparisons, I do not mean to suggest that the Soviet Union has made no economic progress since the October Revolution. But the limited success the Soviet economy has enjoyed in the past was dependent on constant additions to the labor force and on the availability of plentiful and inexpensive resources. Now that the Soviet Union has used up its surplus labor pool and its resources are more costly, its growth rates have plummeted. The Soviet Union, in fact, is no longer closing the gap between itself and the developed West. The per capita consumption comparisons I cited earlier have remained constant over the last decade. Given low Soviet labor productivity, the gap can reasonably be expected to widen in the future.

Shortcomings of the Soviet Economic System

Consumer Shortages and Corruption.

The Soviet economy today is characterized by pervasive shortages of consumer goods and the widespread corruption these shortages generate. These features, moreover, are not temporary problems which will solve themselves through continued progress over time. Rather, they are problems endemic to the Soviet system of centralized economic planning. This system, based on the notion that a small group of planners can efficiently allocate resources for an entire economy, has created instead an economy of bottlenecks, shortages, and waste.

In the Soviet Union, unlike anywhere in the developed West, the most basic consumer goods are in continuous short supply and rationing remains a common fact of Soviet life. The situation has been so bad in some localities in recent years that food riots have reportedly occurred. In 1981, *Izvestia* reported the introduction of rationing in 12 major Soviet cities, including Irkutsk, Kazan, Tbilisi, Vologda, and Naberezhnye Chelny (now called Brezhnev). We have learned that meat and butter have both been formally rationed in the closed city of Sverdlovsk and its surrounding villages for several years. Presumably, the same is true of many other areas closed to foreign visitors.

The long lines of people lining up for scarce items on Soviet city streets have become famous throughout the world. The production and distribution system is so capricious that it is impossible to tell what will be available from one day to the next. This is why Soviet housewives frequently join lines without inquiring what is for sale. They simply assume they had better get whatever it is while it's available. This is also one important cause of Soviet productivity problems, since working people are typically obliged to take unauthorized absences from their jobs to chase after scarce necessities. These endless shortages force the average Soviet family to spend 2 hours shopping every day just to obtain the basic necessities of life.

The endless waiting is bad enough, but the Soviet consumer often finds that the product waiting for him at the front of the line is hardly worth the wait. The quality, variety, and design of the consumer goods available in the Soviet Union are, in fact, notoriously poor by both Western and East European standards, and retail trade and personal service facilities are scarce, primitive, and inefficient.

As one might expect, the chronic shortage of basic consumer goods has fostered the creation of an enormous black market in scarce items. This, in turn, has led to widespread official corruption as persons with administrative control over scarce commodities divert them for personal gain. Corruption exists in all societies, but in the Soviet Union it is a pervasive and normal part of life. Stealing from the state is so common that the Soviet people have come to take it for granted. Anecdotes about corruption and bribery have become a staple of Soviet humor.

The leaders of the Soviet Union are aware of the problem, of course. It has been frequently raised at party plenums, and the Soviet media are replete with stories of corruption, bribery, and the executions of those unfortunate enough to be selected as examples of equal justice under law. What the Soviet leadership seemingly fails to realize or simply will not face is that an economy of shortages inevitably breeds corruption. Some estimate that as much as 25% of the Soviet gross national product (GNP) is diverted to the black market every year.

It must be emphasized once again that the chronic shortages and widespread corruption which characterize contemporary Soviet life are fundamental features of the Soviet economic system. They reflect the systemic inflexibility of a centralized economic planning system which breeds bottlenecks and inefficiencies.

The Soviet consumer is further disadvantaged by the Soviet preference for spending on defense and heavy industry at the expense of the consumer sector. Soviet per capita spending for defense, for example, is, in relative terms, at least twice as high as in any developed Western country. Though we have heard a great many reminders from some of our colleagues here of the importance of the right to life and appeals for an end to the arms race, let us remember that in the 1970s the Soviet Union was the only runner in that arms race, continuing its buildup while the United States was, in effect, engaging in unilateral arms reduction. Today, the Soviet Union spends at least 14% of its GNP on defense, compared to only 7% for the United States. Given the Soviet Union's systemic economic problems and its emphasis on heavy industry and weapons procurement, it is little wonder that Soviet authorities and press commentators chronically complain about the evils of "consumerism" and against the excessive accumulation of material goods.

Effects of Agricultural Collectivization. The Soviet system of collectivized agriculture also contributes to the harshness of Soviet life. Much of the problem in food supply stems from the collectivized nature of Soviet agriculture. As is well known, the forced collectivization of agriculture in the early 1930s divested Soviet farmers of their land. What is not so well known is that the forcible confiscation of grain supplies that accompanied it resulted in a widespread famine that killed as many as 6 million in the Ukraine alone. Collectivization not only killed 6 million people but it permanently crippled Soviet agriculture.

The Soviet Union—in prerevolutionary days the world's largest grain exporter—is now the world's largest grain importer. Twenty percent of the Soviet work force works in agriculture, compared to 3% in the United States. Yet the Soviet Union often has had to import up to 25% of its grain. American farmers, who own their own land, are 10 times more productive than their Soviet counterparts. Each year, approximately 20% of the grain, fruit, and vegetable harvest and as much as 50% of the Soviet potato crop perishes because of the poor storage, transportation, and distribution system.

Soviet farmers have not lost their ability to grow crops. They just lack the incentive to do so on a *kolkhoz* [collective farm]. By contrast, even though private plots, which are farmed by individuals in the early morning and late evening hours, occupy only 4% of the Soviet Union's arable land, they produce 25% of the Soviet Union's total crop output.

Housing Shortages and Deficiencies. Housing in the Soviet Union is in as short supply as most consumer goods. At least 20% of all urban families must share kitchen and toilet facilities with other families. Another 5% live in factory dormitories. Young married couples are typically forced to live with their parents and must wait years for housing of their own.

The housing that does exist is extremely cramped, more so than in any other developed country in the world. The average Soviet citizen has 14 square meters of living space, for example, compared to the 49 square meters available to the average American. This means that there are approximately two people for every room in the Soviet Union, compared with two rooms for every person in the United States. Soviet statistics reveal that in 1983, 32% of all urban housing had no hot water, 23% was without gas, 19% without indoor baths, 12% without central heating,

11% without sewage facilities, and 9% without water.

The housing situation is much worse in the countryside and contains many features reminiscent of the 19th century—or even the 18th. There, for the most part, heating is with fireplaces, food is cooked on wood stoves, out-houses provide the toilet facilities, and water frequently is from a well.

Although there has been much new housing built in the Soviet Union in recent years, almost all of it consists of poorly constructed high-rise apartment buildings, which are even more poorly maintained. At the current rate of construction, the per capita space available to Soviet citizens will begin to approach the Western standard in approximately 150 years. Soviet housing woes should come as no surprise, given the fact that the Soviet Union spends less than one-fifth as much on housing as the United States and well under half of what is spent in Spain and Japan.

Status of Soviet Women. Women in the Soviet Union usually occupy the lowest status and lowest paying jobs in Soviet society. One-third of all working Soviet women, for example, are employed as agricultural laborers. By contrast, only 1.5% of American women are so employed.

Soviet authorities often point to the liberal maternity benefits accorded to Soviet women. Yet the Soviet Union is currently suffering from a severe labor shortage brought on by declining birth rates. This reduction in birth rates, in turn, is due to the extraordinarily high abortion rate. Many women have a history of five or more abortions. The fact is that the low Soviet standard of living compels women to work to supplement the family income. Maternity benefits, with extra mouths to feed and bodies to clothe, are, in many instances, simply not enough to encourage a family to let a child be born.

Unlike Soviet men, the working day of a Soviet woman does not end as she leaves the field or the factory. Soviet women are expected to do the cooking and the housework and the waiting in line.

In the West, women have effectively banded together to fight discrimination and sexism, but Soviet women have no access to effective political power. In its entire history, only one woman has ever served on the Politburo; none serves there now. Fewer than 5% of Central Committee members are female. Interestingly, only one-fourth of Communist Party members are female.

Medical Care and Health Problems. Soviet authorities are often fond of pointing out that health care in the Soviet Union is free. As with so much that is free or subsidized in the Soviet Union, however, you often get what you pay for. Although there are plenty of beds in Soviet hospitals, the people who lie in them frequently receive substandard care. One-third of them, for example, develop postoperative infections due to unsanitary conditions. Most of the doctors who care for them, moreover, are poorly trained by Western standards. Medicine is not a high-prestige occupation in the Soviet Union, and doctors are among the lowest paid workers in Soviet society. Significantly, 70% of these low-paid physicians are women.

Soviet medicine is not immune to the same shortages that afflict the rest of Soviet society. Medical equipment and many medicines are in extremely short supply. One-third of all Soviet hospitals, for example, do not have adequate facilities for blood transfusions. Basic items such as bandages, aspirin, and syringes are often difficult to find. Food rations are so small that patients must supplement their diet with food from home. In Novosibirsk, for example, which is home to many leading Soviet academic institutes and where one would expect supplies to be significantly better than normal, only 11% of the 216 standard drugs to be prescribed for specific illnesses are actually available. These shortages are not surprising in light of the fact that Soviet per capita expenditures on health care are less than one-third the U.S. level.

Although the problems in the Soviet health care delivery system are serious, they are not the most serious medical problem facing the Soviet Union today. Dramatically, over the course of the past two decades a significant deterioration has occurred in the overall health status of the Soviet population. Recent studies show that there has been an increase in Soviet death and morbidity rates over the past 20 years. The life expectancy of Soviet males has decreased during that period by a little over 4 years, from 66 in the mid-1960s to just under 62 years today. In the United States during the same period, male life expectancy increased from 66 to 71 years. Infant mortality in the Soviet Union has increased from 26.2 per 1,000 live births in 1971 to about 40 per 1,000 today. U.S. infant mortality during the same period has decreased from 24.7 per 1,000 to 10.7.

The Soviet figure for infant mortality is necessarily an estimate since Soviet authorities stopped publishing infant mortality statistics after 1974 when the rate had risen to 31.9 per 1,000. This rate was already much higher than in any developed Western country. The Soviet Union also has stopped publishing life expectancy figures. The reason why this has been done is obvious enough. The decrease in male life expectancy and the increase in infant mortality in the Soviet Union are historic events. Never before has a developed, industrialized nation suffered a decline in these demographic indicators in time of peace.

The reasons for this decline are even more disturbing for anyone tempted to look to the Soviet Union as a model for social and economic development. Factors such as poor health care, increased smoking, and frequently unregulated industrial pollution are important, but perhaps the most important contributor is alcohol. This would appear to be the view of Soviet authorities themselves.

The Soviet Union leads the world in the per capita consumption of hard liquor. Much of it is consumed in the form of home-brewed moonshine known as *samogon*. Alcohol consumption in the Soviet Union has more than doubled over the past 25 years. The death rate from alcohol poisoning in the Soviet Union is 88 times the U.S. rate, and alcohol and its effects may be the leading cause of death among Soviet males.

Alcohol abuse in the Soviet Union is not simply a male problem. Alcohol abuse is the third leading cause of illness among Soviet women and is a key factor in both the alarming rise in birth defects and the increased infant mortality rate. By 1980 the net social cost of alcohol abuse in decreased labor productivity in the Soviet Union amounted to a staggering 8%-9% of the total national income.

Much of the heavy drinking in the Soviet Union occurs in the work place. Professor R. Lirmyan of the Soviet Academy of the U.S.S.R. Ministry of Internal Affairs, writing in a 1982 issue of *Molodoy Kommunist*, reported that 37% of the male work force is chronically drunk. Not surprisingly, drunkenness is the leading cause of industrial accidents.

A poll cited in a March 1984 edition of a Soviet journal, *Sovetskaya Rossiya*, revealed that half the Soviet population regards drunkenness as the number one social problem in the Soviet Union. Seventy-four percent said they were alarmed over the extent of public drunkenness. These statistics make clear that the Soviet Union now suffers from an

alcohol abuse problem of epidemic proportions, serious enough to cause a significant rise in the national death rate.

As I remarked earlier, even the Soviet leadership concurs with this assessment. Vitaliy Fedorchuk, the Soviet Minister for Internal Affairs, interviewed in the August 29, 1984, issue of *Literaturnaya Gazeta*, candidly acknowledged that Soviet mortality and sickness rates have been on the increase, and he specifically cited alcohol abuse as the cause.

We note with interest that the Soviet authorities only last week announced yet another campaign against the abuse of alcohol. Production is to be cut back, the drinking age raised, and penalties against the manufacture of home brew increased. While it is possible that these measures may meet with some limited success, we note that similar campaigns have always failed in the past. Our suspicion is that alcohol abuse in the Soviet Union will remain an alarmingly serious problem until the Soviet leadership begins to come to grips with the profound social malaise that gave rise to the problem in the first place. In saying this, I do not mean to deny that there are drug and alcohol abuse problems in the United States and in other countries which deserve our serious attention. But I am suggesting that in the Soviet Union we are dealing with a problem of an entirely different order of magnitude.

Egalitarianism in the Soviet Union

I have been talking at length here about some serious difficulties in the Soviet social and economic system. But there is one more problem I would like to discuss. As we know, Marxist-Leninist ideology claims to be based on the notion of egalitarianism. This, we are told, is what the great October Revolution was all about. One would, therefore, expect that whatever problems the Soviet Union might have, the Soviet authorities would ensure that no class or group or individuals would ever be accorded privileges not available to other members of Soviet society.

But the truth is that certain groups in Soviet society (the party, the military officer corps, the diplomatic corps, the scientific-technical intelligentsia, the cultural and sports establishments) have deliberately shielded themselves from the social and economic hardships faced by the rest of the population. A privileged 5% of the Soviet population,

Maintaining Momentum in the Middle East Peace Process

by Richard W. Murphy

Address before the American Council of Young Political Leaders on June 27, 1985. Ambassador Murphy is Assistant Secretary for Near Eastern and South Asian Affairs.

I appreciate this opportunity to discuss our policy in the Middle East. The current terrorist hijacking of TWA Flight #847 reminds us that peace in the Middle East has enemies. Extremists and terrorists seek to undermine the forces of moderation in the region. The tragic violence in Lebanon highlights and makes more urgent the need for a negotiated peace settlement in the region. That key—to the stability and security of the Middle East—is the peace process.

The United States has been actively involved for more than two decades in the search for peace in the Middle East. We have had some success, but there is still a difficult road ahead to reach our goal of direct negotiations and peace between Israel and its Arab neighbors. There has recently been positive movement in this direction, much of it due to King Hussein's courageous initiatives.

The Movement Toward Negotiations

Let me share with you some ideas on where we are in the peace process and where we are likely to be going in the months ahead. The two key themes which are at the heart of our efforts are pragmatism and process. We are now seeing concrete proposals from both sides which address the problem of getting negotiations started rather than focusing on a desired outcome. We now see a willingness to face the hard, practical steps that lie ahead. I would like to explore with you how these concepts relate to recent developments and our expectations for the future.

A new momentum began to develop late last year. At that time, and for the first few months of this year, the key parties in the region seemed content for us to step back a bit and let them work out some of their immediate problems. On the Israeli side, this was largely a result of domestic political considerations. The results of the last election in Israel were inconclusive in many respects and led to a unique experiment in power-sharing between Likud and Labor.

known as the *Nomenklatura*, has access to special "closed" stores that are specially stocked with foreign goods not available in regular stores, as well as bountiful supplies of Soviet goods that are in short supply elsewhere. The average Soviet citizen is forbidden from entering these stores, which are unmarked and have opaque windows to prevent the curious from looking in. Housing space is allocated by state authorities on the basis of social status. Many leading Soviet organizations have their own housing facilities, which are of good standard and centrally located.

The Fourth Directorate of the Ministry of Health runs a closed system of hospitals, clinics, and dispensaries for the *Nomenklatura*, providing far better services than those available to the general population. The Soviet ruling oligarchy also has access to such special benefits as foreign travel, automobiles, admission to the best schools, country houses, access to cultural events, and paid vacations in choice resorts, which are not available to the average citizen. Even the center lanes of certain roads are closed off for their exclusive personal use. To quote from George Orwell's *Animal Farm*: "All animals are equal, but some are more equal than others."

Conclusion

In an earlier intervention, the distinguished Soviet representative suggested that we were reluctant to discuss social and economic issues in this forum. I hope I have succeeded in dispelling this impression. Despite our many problems, we believe that we in the West, with our pluralistic, mixed-market economies, have gone further toward meeting basic human social and economic aspirations than has the system now in place in the Soviet Union.

More than 35 years ago, there was published a collection of essays authored by prominent former communists or fellow travelers, including Ignazio Silone, Andre Gide, Richard Wright, and Arthur Koestler. The book was entitled *The God That Failed*. Each of these prominent writers explained in his own words why he had concluded that the price in terms of personal freedom was not worth paying to attain the promised goal of a future paradise. The decades that passed have demonstrated that the image of paradise off in the distance was only a mirage. ■

For the new Israeli Government, getting Israeli forces out of Lebanon was a primary consideration across clearly during the campaign. It was one of the issues on which there was consensus within Israel.

The second priority for the new electorate was the need to stabilize the economy. Inflation rates had reached, in the month of October, an annual rate of 1,200%. Although the Israelis have taken several steps, they still have further to go to achieve a comprehensive economic reform plan. This may seem a separate question and unrelated to the peace process, but it demands immediate attention of Israel's leadership to reduce their ability to deal with these problems.

The Arab states, particularly Syria, cited the Israeli military presence in Lebanon as one of the reasons for their lack of movement on negotiation. "cold peace" between Egypt and Israel. Other issues noted by the Egyptians, inhibiting progress were the status of Taba, a small piece of property on the border, and the Egyptian desire to focus greater attention on the quality of life of the Palestinian inhabitants of the occupied territories. There has been some movement on these issues, too. The Egyptians and the Israelis have resumed discussion of the status of Taba, and the Israeli government has been taking steps toward ameliorating the conditions of the residents of the West Bank. Improvement in this relationship is so important for the psychological well-being of the region that it would have an impact on the climate for peace in the region.

On the Arab side, there has been some very encouraging developments. A new sense of pragmatism appears to have opened up unique possibilities for movement. These developments began last October with Jordan's decision to resume formal diplomatic relations with Egypt. In November, the national conference of the Palestine National Council meeting was held in Amman, Jordan, and the prospects for cooperation between Jordan and the PLO [Palestine Liberation Organization]. King Hussein, addressing the PNC, called on the Arab states to join him in seeking a negotiated settlement based on UN Security Council Resolution 242. The PLO did not respond to Hussein's call out of hand.

Comparing the U.S. and U.S.S.R. on Social and Economic Issues



United States Department of State
Bureau of Public Affairs
Washington, D.C.

Following is an address by Ambassador Warren Zimmermann, Chairman of the U.S. delegation, before a plenary session of the followup meeting of the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe, Vienna, Austria, December 12, 1986.

In my remarks today, I wish to correct a misunderstanding that may have crept into our debate during the past several weeks. Many of the Western delegations gathered here, my own included, have spent considerable time reviewing Soviet and Eastern violations of civil and political rights. Rather than respond directly to these criticisms, our Soviet and Eastern colleagues have counter-attacked by raising alleged Western violations of social and economic rights. They have charged us with permitting poverty, unemployment, and homelessness. They have even accused us of racial prejudice.

This difference in emphasis might tempt someone unfamiliar with the true nature of our respective societies to conclude that social and economic issues are less important to us than they are to our Soviet and Eastern neighbors and that we don't do as good a job in this area. This is the misunderstanding I wish to correct.

My government's view is that the Soviet and Eastern record on social and economic issues is at least as bad as its record on civil and political rights. We have not emphasized these issues here because we do not believe they concern matters of basic human rights. Rather, these "quality of life" issues concern

basic human goals and aspirations. As individuals, we seek to provide happy, meaningful lives for ourselves and our families, free from fear and want. As governments, we seek to foster conditions in which more and more of our people can lead better and better lives.

Soviet and Eastern governments would have us believe that these basic human goals and aspirations can best be met by centralized planning and various kinds of social guarantees. In the West, we favor pluralist, mixed-market systems, which stress both social welfare and individual enterprise.

While there is probably no *a priori* way to determine which approach is best, we do have the benefit of decades of experience to serve as a basis for comparison. In my remarks today, I will compare Western and Eastern performance on social and economic issues. In so doing, I will take due account of Soviet and Eastern criticisms of Western performance.

Although my remarks will center on a comparison of U.S. and Soviet performance, the substance of what I have to say applies for West versus East generally. In our view, the problems with Eastern performance are systemic ones.

Poverty and Unemployment

Earlier in this meeting, the representative of the Soviet Union criticized my country for poverty and unemployment. It would be disingenuous of me to deny the substance of his remarks. Poverty

and unemployment do exist in the United States. In 1985, 14% of Americans lived beneath the official U.S. poverty line. This is an unacceptably high percentage of our population, and no U.S. Government can truly be satisfied until poverty is eliminated from our country once and for all.

Poverty is, of course, a relative concept. In the United States, a family of four is considered poor if its annual income falls below \$10,989 per year. This level is not comparable to the subsistence-level income which plagues so much of the world's population even today. It is an income which forces American families to live and eat cheaply and to survive without the luxuries that have become commonplace in U.S. life. And even this income does not include benefits derived from such government programs as food stamps, Medicare, housing subsidies, and others.

As University of Surrey Professor Mervyn Matthews has shown, if the U.S. definition of poverty were applied to the Soviet Union, a majority of the Soviet population would fall beneath the official U.S. poverty line. The average Soviet citizen, by standards the United States applies to itself, would be poor. This is not surprising, given the fact that Soviet per capita consumption is currently only one-third the U.S. level.

Unemployment also exists in the United States, as it does in all mixed-market economies. Currently, 7% of U.S. workers are unemployed. This figure is too high, though much lower than in the early 1980s; and President

Reagan's Administration is seeking to lower it further. But it should be kept in mind that nearly half of U.S. unemployment results from voluntary movement out of, or within, the labor force, as workers leave or change their jobs. Moreover, of these, nearly 50% find a new job within 5 weeks and 90% within 6 months. Of those out of work due to involuntary causes, more than two-thirds secure new jobs within 6 months. Unemployment in the United States does not mean abandonment. Virtually every worker in the United States is eligible for some form of unemployment benefits. Each year the U.S. Government spends hundreds of millions of dollars on such benefit programs.

No one would deny that unemployment is a necessary evil of market economies, but its impact must be kept in perspective. Unemployment provides market economies with a flexibility essential in accelerating economic growth. While unemployed people suffer a temporary lowering of living standards, the average American family with an unemployed worker still earns an income of \$20,000 a year. A Soviet family with this kind of income would number among the Soviet economic elite. In unemployment, as with poverty, everything is relative.

It is not my intention to minimize the problems caused by poverty and unemployment in my own country. But it is my intention to compare systems. The United States is a nation where most people are quite comfortable and where poverty is relatively rare. The Soviet Union, on the other hand, is a country where people are considerably less comfortable and where poverty is quite common.

Markedly lower Soviet living standards, moreover, are not an accident of history but reflect the systemic inflexibility of a centrally planned economic system which breeds bottlenecks and inefficiencies. Pervasive shortages of consumer goods, including formal and informal food rationing, are common features of Soviet life. These shortages have created an enormous black market in scarce commodities. An estimated 25% of Soviet gross national product finds its way to the black market every year. The black market has, in turn, led to widespread corruption as officials with administrative control over scarce commodities divert them for personal gain.

These problems and more are shared to varying degrees by most Eastern countries. Their living standards lag far behind those of their Western neighbors, and their low relative rates of productivity give them small hope of ever catching up. We in the West have our economic

problems, but they pale in comparison to those of our neighbors to the East.

Social Problems

Quality of life is not simply a function of per capita consumption. Social values and the content and character of social policy and social life are also important. The Soviet representative, in his earlier remarks, accused my country of a number of social failings, including racism, a high crime rate, homelessness, inadequate medical care, and even genocide. As I stated earlier, my country is not perfect and has many problems. It has social problems as well as economic ones. But once again, let us compare.

Genocide. In many ways, the charge of genocide against our indigenous population is both the most serious and the most ludicrous charge. It is true that the Indian population of North America was once greater than it is today. But the great reduction in the native American population occurred not in this century, or even in the 19th century, but in the first centuries following the arrival of Columbus, when up to 90% of the Indian population in some areas perished through war or pestilence. In fact, over the past 100 years, the U.S. Indian population has increased more than fivefold, from 274,000 to the current 1.5 million.

If the Soviet representative wishes to find more recent examples of large-scale depopulation, he would do better to look to the 1930s in his own country, when millions died in Stalin's purges and millions more in the deliberately induced Ukrainian famine.

Racism. The charge of racism leveled against my country is also a serious one, but one that does not withstand serious analysis. Racist attitudes do persist in my country. Such attitudes unfortunately persist in all our countries, including the Soviet Union. As is well known, in my country, our black population has been particularly victimized by such attitudes. Over the past 25 years, however, enormous progress has been made in eliminating racial prejudice and extending equal opportunities to all. The number of blacks in U.S. universities has increased from 7% to 19%. The number of black elected officials has increased to 6,000, including 23 congressmen and the mayors of 4 of our 10 largest cities. Black incomes have increased at almost twice the rate of white incomes. Last year, the adjusted medium incomes of black families grew by 5%, greater than any other racial group. Today, the most popular program on U.S. television is about a black family. Our most popular

movie star is black, as are many of the top names in American popular music and in American sport.

While we still have a long way to go, we are encouraged by our progress. Throughout this struggle, the U.S. Government and the American judicial system have played a leading role in increasing opportunities for blacks and other minorities and in fighting the scourge of racism. This is in stark contrast to the behavior of the Soviet Government, which has deliberately fanned the flames of Soviet anti-Semitism in its attempt to discredit the Jewish emigration movement.

Crime. Crime is also a serious problem in my country, although the crime rate has fallen somewhat over the past several years. Increasing crime rates appear to be an unwelcome concomitant of urbanization and industrialization throughout our world. Some societies, largely for cultural reasons, seem to have escaped relatively unscathed. A number of European countries are in this category. The Soviet Union, however, is not among them. Soviet authorities have grudgingly admitted to a steadily increasing crime rate, and the Soviet Union's prisoner population is estimated to be four times higher than that of the United States. Since Soviet authorities do not publish their crime statistics, we can only guess at the true situation. But it hardly seems fair for them to criticize us while shrouding their own performance behind a veil of secrecy.

Homelessness and Health Care. Guaranteed housing and free medical care are two of the most highly publicized cornerstones of the Soviet social system. It is not surprising, therefore, that the Soviet representative would criticize my country for tolerating homelessness or cast aspersions on our health care system.

Homelessness does exist in America. The number of homeless is not 2 million or 3 million, as Soviet representatives asserted on separate occasions, but approximately 350,000. The majority of these homeless people are either mentally ill, alcoholic, or both.

Shelters are available, at no cost, to each and every one of them. Ninety-five percent of these shelters are open year round and provide meals free of charge. For the most part, those who spend the night on the streets do so through free choice. They cannot be simply cleared from the streets or incarcerated in mental institutions because our courts have ruled such treatment a violation of their rights. Like it or not, in my country people have the right to sleep on grates.

In the Soviet Union, official homelessness does not exist. But people find themselves squeezed into the most cramped housing in the industrialized world.

Five percent more live in factory dormitories. Young people must wait years for housing of their own. At the current rate of housing construction, the [redacted] available to Soviet citizens [redacted] still [redacted]

Soviet statistics reveal that in 1985, 29% of all state-owned urban housing had no hot water, 22% was without gas, 17% without indoor baths, 11% without central heating, 10% without sewage facilities, and 8% without water. This is the best Soviet housing. In the countryside, the situation is incomparably worse.

Medical care in the United States can be expensive, but comprehensive health insurance is widely available and heavily subsidized for retired persons. The quality of the care is among the highest in world. In the Soviet Union, the situation is markedly different. Although health care is free, Soviet citizens often get what they pay for. Doctors are poorly trained and are among the lowest paid workers in Soviet society. Medical equipment and even the most basic medicines are in chronic short supply. [redacted] for example, [redacted]

Unsanitary conditions result in 30% of all postoperative patients developing infections. Three percent is considered high in the West.

The Soviet health care system is, in fact, in the midst of a crisis of potentially catastrophic proportions. Over the past two decades, there has been a dramatic increase in Soviet death and morbidity rates. [redacted] in [redacted] now almost four times higher than the U.S. rate. Male life expectancy over the period has decreased by more than 4 years. [redacted] 66 in the [redacted]

indicating a precipitous decline in demographic indicators in time of peace.

The cause of these dramatic reversals can be traced to the inability of the Soviet health care system to deal with

the diseases of contemporary urban life. This is not surprising, given the fact that the proportion of Soviet national income devoted to health care has been decreasing since the mid-1950s. Currently, the Soviet Union spends only a third as much on health care as the United States.

Education. I have not heard our Soviet colleagues criticize the American educational system, so there is no need to draw a comparison in this area. I am proud of the quality of American education. Nevertheless, I want unilaterally to compliment the Soviet Union on the quality of its own primary and secondary education. My three children have attended a typical Moscow school, in which each was the only foreign child in his or her class. I can report that their experience was a positive and enriching one, and I am glad in this forum to have the opportunity to say so.

Conclusion

In my remarks today, I have compared the United States and the Soviet Union on a variety of social and economic issues. I have conceded that the United States has serious problems in a number of areas, but I have argued that these pale by comparison with Soviet social and economic problems, which are of an altogether different order of magnitude. I have suggested, moreover, that these Soviet problems are shared by several of their Eastern allies since, in large part, they result from difficulties inherent in the Soviet communist system. President Kennedy once remarked: "Freedom has many difficulties and democracy is not perfect, but we have never had to put up a wall to keep our people in."

Most of my discussion has focused on specific issues. In concluding my remarks, I would like to say something more basic about the difference in the quality of life between West and East. Western societies, for all their problems, are vibrant, growing organisms. There is food to eat, things to buy, places to go, and things to do. Competition continues to move our societies forward. Men and women continue to improve their lot in life and, in so doing, enrich the society around them. We combine tradition and change in ways that make our lives both more convenient and more chaotic.

Eastern societies, by comparison, tend to be shabbier and drearier. Buildings are more dilapidated, and there are more potholes in the streets.

There is less to eat, less to buy, fewer places to go, fewer things to do. Since competition is, for the most part, disdained, there is little incentive to work harder and little upward mobility. People drink more to pass the time. In the Soviet Union, drinking has become a social problem of epidemic proportions, as has been commendably recognized by General Secretary Gorbachev. Young people continue to dream the dreams of youth, but their music and fashions come from the West. While revolutionary exhortations still appear everywhere, the dominant impression is one of stagnation and malaise.

In recent months, however, there have been signs of change in the East. The new Soviet leadership has acknowledged, at least to some extent, the social and economic crisis facing the Soviet Union. There have been calls from the very top for fundamental reform. My government has watched these developments with interest and sympathy. We hope that Soviet concern will result in better living conditions for the Soviet people. To date, there has been more talk than action, but we understand that there is massive inertia which must be overcome. Whatever the future may hold, however, of this much we can be certain. If the Soviet Union does someday hope to match the social and economic performance of the West, then it must move its system dramatically, fundamentally, in the direction of the openness, competitiveness, and freedom characteristic of the Western system.

I explained at the outset of my remarks that I wished to correct a misunderstanding. I did not want to convey the impression that my delegation or other Western delegations believed that social and economic issues were unimportant. They are crucially important. Above all, I did not wish to leave our Soviet and Eastern colleagues with the feeling that these were their issues. These are not their issues; they are our issues. And if they persist in raising them, we will be more than happy to compare. ■

Published by the United States Department of State • Bureau of Public Affairs
Office of Public Communication • Editorial Division • Washington, D.C. • January 1987
Editor: Cynthia Saboe • This material is in the public domain and may be reproduced without permission; citation of this source is appreciated.

most basic kind -- too little food. The Soviet Union still cannot feed itself. East Germany has made strides, but at harvest time the news announcers still speak, to use the well-known phrase, of "the battle to bring in the crops."

After these four decades, then, there stands before the entire world one great and inescapable conclusion. Freedom leads to prosperity. Freedom replaces the ancient hatreds between the nations with comity and peace.

Freiheit -- Freiheit ist der Sieger. [Freedom is the victor.]

Now the Soviets themselves may at last be coming to understand the importance of freedom. We hear much from Moscow about a new policy of openness and reform -- to use the Russian term, "glasnost." Some political prisoners have been released. Certain foreign news broadcasts are no longer being jammed. Some economic enterprises have been permitted to operate with greater freedom from state control.

Are these the beginnings of profound changes in the Soviet state? Or are they token gestures, intended only to raise false hopes in the West? We want to encourage change and openness. We want new agreements -- especially those that will reduce nuclear arms.

There is one sign the Soviets can make that would be unmistakable, that would advance dramatically the cause of understanding between nations, the cause of peace and freedom.

General Secretary Gorbachev, if you seek peace, ~~and~~
~~if~~, if you seek prosperity for the Soviet Union and Eastern

Europe _____, if you seek liberalization, _____

Come here, to this gate.

Herr Gorbachev, machen Sie dieses Tor auf. [Mr. Gorbachev, open this gate.]

Mr. Gorbachev, tear down this wall.

While we watch and wait, we in the West must resist Soviet expansion. So we must maintain defenses of unassailable strength. Yet it is our nature as free peoples to make manifest our goodwill. So we must strive to reduce arms on both sides.

Beginning 10 years ago, the Soviets challenged the Western Alliance with a grave new threat: the deployment of hundreds of nuclear missiles, capable of striking every capital in Europe. The Western Alliance responded by committing itself to a counter-deployment -- unless the Soviets agreed to negotiate a better solution. For many months, the Soviets refused to come to the table. As the Alliance in turn prepared to go forward with its counter-deployment, there were difficult days -- days of protests like those during my 1982 visit to this city.

But through it all, the Alliance held firm. And I invite those who protested then -- I invite those who protest today -- to mark this fact: Because we remained strong, the Soviets came to the table. Because we remained strong, today we are engaged in talks that hold out the possibility, not merely of limiting the growth of arms, but of eliminating, for the first time, an entire class of nuclear weapons from the face of the Earth.

TR

WHITE HOUSE STAFFING MEMORANDUM

DATE: 5/29/87 ACTION/CONCURRENCE/COMMENT DUE BY: 2:00 p.m. TODAYSUBJECT: PRESIDENTIAL ADDRESS: BRANDENBURG GATE (REVISED)
(5/29 -- 9:00 a.m. draft)

	ACTION FYI			ACTION FYI	
VICE PRESIDENT	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	FITZWATER	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
BAKER	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	GRISCOM	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
DUBERSTEIN	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	HENKEL	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
MILLER - OMB	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	HOBBS	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
BALL	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	KING	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
BAUER	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	MASENG	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
CARLUCCI	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	RISQUE	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
CRIBB	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	RYAN	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
CRIPPEN	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	SPRINKEL	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
CULVAHOUSE	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	TUTTLE	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
DAWSON	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	DOLAN	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
DONATELLI	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

REMARKS:

Please provide any comments on the attached revised address directly to Tony Dolan by 2:00 p.m. today, with an info copy to my office. Thank you.

RESPONSE:

on p. 5/6 - Gorbachev has just been to E. Berlin. we should rework the challenge *TR*

(Robinson/ARD)

May 27, 1987

1:30 p.m.

Teresa

re-staff

PRESIDENTIAL ADDRESS: BRANDENBURG GATE
WEST BERLIN, GERMANY
JUNE 12, 1987

1987
M63
24

President von Weizsaecker, Chancellor Kohl, Governing Mayor
Diepgen, ladies and gentlemen: 24 years ago, ~~Harry Truman~~ ^{John Kennedy} became
the first American President to visit Berlin, speaking to the
people of this city and the world at ~~Rudolph Wilde Platz~~ ^{Rudolph Wilde Platz}. Since then,
2 other Presidents have come, each in his turn, to Berlin. Today I
myself make my second visit to your city.

X
X
X

750 years
Berlin
phosphor

We come to Berlin, we American Presidents, because it is our
duty to speak, in this place, of freedom. But I must confess, we
are drawn here by other things as well: By the feeling of
history in this city, more than 500 years older than our own
Nation. By the sense of energy in your streets. By the beauty
of the Grunwald and Tiergarten. Above all, by your courage and
friendship.

ok

X

Perhaps Marlene Dietrich understood something about American
Presidents. You see, like so many Presidents before me, I come
here today because wherever I go, whatever I do: "Ich hab noch
einen koffer in Berlin." ["I still have a suitcase in Berlin" --
words from a much-loved song.]

Our gathering today is being broadcast throughout Western
Europe and North America. I understand that it is being
broadcast as well in the East -- [that Berlin television can be
seen as far to the southeast as Prague, as far to the northeast
as Gdansk;] that Berlin radio can be picked up as far due east as
Moscow.

short
wave
radio history

To those listening throughout Eastern Europe, I extend my warmest greetings and the goodwill of the American people. To those listening in East Berlin, a special word. Although I cannot be with you, I address my remarks to you just as surely as to those standing here before me. For I join you as I join your fellow citizens in the West in this firm, this unalterable belief: [In German:] There is only one Berlin.

[Behind me stands a wall that divides the entire continent of Europe. From the Baltic to the Harz Mountains it cuts across Germany in one continuous gash of concrete, barbed wire, guard towers, dog runs, and gun emplacements. In places farther south, there may be no visible, no obvious wall.] But there remain armed guards and checkpoints all the same -- still a restriction on the right to travel, still an instrument to impose upon ordinary men and women the will of a totalitarian state.

Yet it is here in Berlin where the wall emerges most clearly; here, cutting across your city, where the newsphoto and the television screen have imprinted this brutal division of a continent upon the mind of the world. Standing before the Brandenburg Gate, any man is a German, separated from his fellow men. Any man is a Berliner, forced to look upon a scar.

President von Weizsaecker has said: The German question is open as long as the Brandenburg Gate is closed. Today I say: As long as this gate is closed, as long as this scar of a wall is permitted to stand, it is not the German question alone that remains open, but the question of freedom for all mankind.

Yet I do not come here to lament. For I find in Berlin a message of hope -- even, in the shadow of this wall, a message of triumph.

In this season of spring in 1945, the people of Berlin emerged from their air-raid shelters to find devastation. Streets choked with rubble. One building in five destroyed. Eighty thousand lying dead. Thousands of miles away, the people of the United States reached out to help. In announcing the Marshall Plan, Secretary of State George Marshall stated precisely 40 years ago this week: "Our policy is directed not against any country or doctrine, but against hunger, poverty, desperation, and chaos."

In the Reichstag a few moments ago, I saw a display commemorating this 40th anniversary of the Marshall Plan. I was struck by the sign on a burnt-out, gutted structure that was being rebuilt. I understand that Berliners of my own generation can remember seeing signs like it dotted throughout the Western sectors of the city. The sign read simply: "The Marshall Plan at work. For the building of a Free World."

"[T]he building of a Free World" -- in the West, that building took place. Japan rose from ruin to become an economic giant. Italy, France, Belgium -- each saw political and economic rebirth.

In the Federal Republic of Germany, there took place an economic miracle, the "Wirtschaftswunder." Adenauer, Erhard, and others understood the practical importance of liberty -- that just as truth can flourish only when the journalist is given

freedom of speech, so prosperity can come about only when the farmer and businessman enjoy economic freedom. The German leaders reduced tariffs, expanded free trade, lowered taxes. From 1950 to 1960 alone, the standard of living in the Federal Republic more than doubled.

Here in Berlin there took place a transformation. Where four decades ago there was rubble, today there is the greatest industrial output of any city in Germany; busy office blocks; fine homes and apartments; proud avenues and the spreading lawns of parkland. Where a city's culture seemed to have been destroyed, today there are two universities, an opera and a philharmonic orchestra, countless theaters and museums. Where there was want, today there is abundance -- food, clothing, automobiles; the luxury goods of the Ku'damm; even home computers.

From the rubble -- from the utter ruin -- you Berliners have in freedom rebuilt a city that once again ranks as one of the greatest on Earth. The Soviets may have had other plans. But, my friends, there was one thing the Soviets didn't count on: Berliner schnauze. Ja, Berliner schnauze -- und mit herz.

["Berliner schnauze" is a well-known phrase meaning courage mixed with good humor, "chutzpah." "Und mit herz" means "and with heart."]

Soon after the War, Khrushchev predicted: "We will bury you." Yet, in the West today, we see a free world that has achieved a level of prosperity and well-being unprecedented in all human history. While in the East -- in the East, we see

11/Am
5/28/87

technological backwardness. Declining standards of health. Even want of the most basic kind -- too little food. The Soviet Union still cannot feed itself. In East Germany, at harvest time the news announcers still speak, to use the well-known phrase, of "the battle to bring in the crops."

After these four decades, then, there stands before the entire world one great and inescapable conclusion. Totalitarianism? Totalitarianism produces failure. Freedom? Freedom leads to prosperity and replaces the ancient hatreds between the nations with comity and peace.

How then are we in the free world to deal with the totalitarian East? Let me say at the outset that I understand the fear of war and the pain of division that afflict this continent. So I pledge my country to peace -- and to the expansion throughout Europe of liberty.

To these ends, we in the West must force the Soviets to deal with their own internal problems, not attempt to flee them by expanding still more. So we must maintain defenses of unassailable strength. And yet it is our nature as free peoples to make manifest our goodwill. So we must strive to reduce arms on both sides.

Just 10 years ago, the Soviets challenged the Western Alliance with a grave new threat: the deployment of hundreds of nuclear missiles, capable of striking every capital in Europe. As the Alliance weighed its response, there were difficult days -- days of protests like those that took place during my 1982 visit to this city.

But the Alliance held firm, moving to counter the Soviet threat. And I invite those who protested then -- I invite those who protest today -- to mark this fact: Because we remained strong, the Soviets came to the table. Because we remained strong, today we are engaged in talks that promise not merely limitations on the growth of arms, but deep and verifiable arms reductions.

As I speak, NATO ministers are meeting in Iceland to consider our proposals for reducing I.N.F.'s, intermediate-range nuclear forces. We have proposed deep cuts in strategic forces at the START talks in Geneva. Indeed, we have proposed sharp cuts in virtually every aspect of the nuclear forces now based in Europe.

Today I will go further.

It is well-known that we in the West require nuclear forces not only to counterbalance Soviet nuclear missiles, but to make up as well for the superiority of Soviet conventional forces virtually throughout Eastern Europe. So today I challenge the Soviets. Those thousands of troops -- those massive conventional forces of all kinds -- that are in place in Eastern Europe not to maintain the military balance but only to secure Soviet domination: Withdraw them. For the sake of arms control -- for the sake of peace in Europe -- withdraw them.

The resolve to defend ourselves, the determination to reduce the nuclear threat -- our Strategic Defense Initiative makes both clear. In East and West alike, today nuclear strategy is based upon the threat of massive retaliation. The Strategic Defense

Initiative holds out the hope of a fundamental change -- the hope that we might soon be able to destroy nuclear missiles aimed at Europe or North America before they strike their targets. As I have stated before, when we develop this technology, we will make it available to the Soviet Union -- the shield-bearer offering a shield to its opponent. The Strategic Defense Initiative will provide Europe, North America, and -- if the Soviets are willing -- the Soviet Union itself, with a defense that truly defends.

The need for strong defenses is of course nowhere more apparent than here in Berlin. Today as in the past, our Nation remains utterly committed to the freedom of the western sectors. The United States will continue to pursue strict observance and full implementation of all parts of the Four Power Agreement of 1971. We intend to work in particular for fuller implementation of the provisions that call for ties between the western sectors of Berlin and the Federal Republic of Germany.

Yet it is possible to speak in Berlin today not only of maintaining defenses, but of launching initiatives. It is possible to speak of Berlin reaching out to the East -- reaching out, to demonstrate to its neighbors the power of freedom. So let us speak to the world of signals of openness and goodwill -- Signals From Berlin.

Governing Mayor Diepgen, as the first signal, I will with your approval propose to the Soviets that at the conclusion of the Vienna Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe, the United States and the Soviet Union hold a second meeting here in

Berlin, alternating between the two parts of the city. As a second signal, I am willing -- I am eager -- to schedule arms control negotiations in the two sectors of this city. Perhaps as a further signal the Berlin Senat could invite the United Nations to hold conferences here in Berlin.

As a signal of immense importance, together with our British and French allies, the United States will in coming weeks negotiate new air corridor agreements for Berlin. These agreements will open Berlin still further to East and West alike.

If you will permit me, one final suggestion. Sport represents a source of enjoyment and ennoblement, and you may have noted that the Republic of Korea -- South Korea -- has offered to permit certain events of the 1988 Olympics to take place in the North. What better way to signal goodwill toward the East -- what better way to signal to the world the openness of this city -- than in some coming year to hold the Olympic Games here in Berlin, East and West?

Perhaps when President Kennedy spoke at the Rudolph Wilde Platz 24 years ago, it was freedom that was encircled, Berlin that was under siege. No longer. Despite all the pressures upon this city, Berlin stands secure in its liberty. And today freedom itself is transforming the globe.

In the Philippines; in Argentina, Brazil, and across Latin America, democracy has been given a rebirth. Throughout the Pacific, free markets are working miracle after miracle of economic growth -- even the Peoples' Republic of China has granted important new freedoms. In the industrialized nations, a

technological revolution is taking place -- a revolution marked by rapid, dramatic advances in computers and telecommunications.

In Europe, only one nation and those it controls refuse to join the community of freedom. Yet in this age of redoubled economic growth, of information and innovation, the Soviet Union faces a choice. It must make fundamental changes. Or it will become obsolete.

The Soviets themselves may be coming to understand this. We hear much from Moscow about a new policy of openness and liberalization -- to use the Russian term, "glasnost." Some political prisoners have been released. B.B.C. broadcasts are no longer jammed. Certain small enterprises have been permitted to operate with greater freedom from state control.

Are these the beginnings of profound changes in the Soviet state? Or are they token gestures, intended in large part to raise false hopes in the West? It is impossible to tell.

But there is one sign the Soviets can make that would be unmistakable.

General Secretary Gorbachev, 15 days ago, you were in Berlin. Now I say to you: If you truly seek peace, come back. If you truly seek prosperity for the Soviet Union and Eastern Europe, come back. If you truly seek liberalization -- if you truly seek "glasnost" -- come back.

Come here, to this gate.

Herr Gorbachev, machen Sie dieses Tor auf. [Mr. Gorbachev, open this gate.] Herr Gorbachev, tear down this wall.

WA
1945

In these four decades, as I have said, you Berliners have rebuilt a great city. You have done so in spite of threats: The Soviet attempts to impose the East-mark. The blockade. Today the city thrives in spite of the challenge implicit in the very presence of this wall.

What keeps you here? What persuades you to stay when you could so easily travel to the West? I spoke earlier of "Berliner schnauze," and of course there is a great deal to be said for your fortitude, for your defiant courage.

But I believe that there is something deeper. Something that involves Berlin's whole look and feel and way of life. Not mere sentiment -- no one could live long in Berlin without being completely disabused of illusions. Something instead, something that sees the difficulties of life in Berlin but chooses to accept them. That stubbornly refuses to abandon this good and proud city to a surrounding presence that is merely brutish. Something that speaks with a voice of powerful affirmation -- that says yes to this city, yes to the future, yes to freedom. In a word, I would submit that what keeps you in Berlin is love -- love both profound and abiding.

Perhaps this gets to the root of the matter, to the most fundamental distinction of all between East and West. The totalitarian world does not produce low living standards and backwardness because of some technical shortcoming in its economic arrangements. It produces backwardness because it does such violence to the spirit, thwarting the human impulse to create, to enjoy, to worship.

The totalitarian world finds even symbols of love an affront. During the War, the sculpture atop the Brandenburg Gate was taken down for safekeeping and stored here, in the Western sectors of the city. In 19__, the West turned the sculpture over to the East in a gesture of goodwill, and soon the sculpture was once again looking out upon "Unter den Linden" [the main avenue in East Berlin]. But something was different. The cross -- the cross the figure had borne aloft for nearly 150 years -- that cross was gone. In its place was a Communist wreath.

__ years later, authorities in the East erected what is now the tallest structure in the city, the television tower above Alexanderplatz. I understand that virtually ever since, the authorities have been working to correct what they view as the tower's one major flaw, treating the glass dome at the top with paints and chemicals of every kind. Yet even today when the sun strikes that dome -- that dome that towers over all Berlin -- the light makes the sign of the cross.

As I looked out a moment ago from the Reichstag -- that embodiment of German unity -- I noticed words crudely spray-painted upon the wall -- perhaps by a young Berliner -- words that answer the German question. "This wall will fall. Beliefs become reality."

Yes, across Europe, this wall will fall. For in the end it cannot withstand faith. It cannot withstand truth.

Die Mauer kann Freiheit nicht zuruckhalten. [The wall cannot withstand freedom.]

Thank you. God bless you all.

NSC Comments on Revised Brandenburg Gate Address

The 27 May draft is predictably strong on the themes of freedom and its defense, which are unarguably appropriate to the occasion and the conceptual foundation of the speech. But the speech needs more than that foundation. Throughout, tone and substance need to be introduced along the lines of our and Berlin/Bonn's earlier suggestions, which relate the fundamental themes to the practical requirements of protecting and expanding freedom in the real situation perceived by Berliners and Europeans. We should not forget this is an important policy speech aimed at an European audience. The wrong thrust could do us real harm. The speech needs some positive themes showing we are responsive to European anxieties.

Without this honing and toning, the speech, the President, and the US risk appearing irrelevant to the larger audience, appealing to whom is the very purpose of the President's trip. The specific initiatives ("Signals from Berlin") also need to be reworded to be sound politically and diplomatically, but that is an easier problem to fix than the overall tone and thrust.

We plan to provide specific suggestions and changes by COB Thursday, May 28.

Lists of Visits of
Presidents of the
United States to
Foreign Countries,
1789-1983

<u>COUNTRY VISITED</u>	<u>DATE OF VISIT</u>	<u>PRESIDENT</u>
France: Paris, Normandy, Bayeux, and Versailles	1978 January 4-6	Carter
France: Guadeloupe	1979 January 4-9	Carter
France: Paris	1982 June 2-7	Reagan
France: Versailles	1982 June 5-6	Reagan
Germany: Potsdam	1945 July 16-August 1	Truman
Germany, Federal Republic of: Bonn	1959 August 26-27	Eisenhower
Germany, Federal Republic of: Bonn, Cologne, Frankfurt, Wiesbaden, [REDACTED]	1963 June 23-26	Kennedy
Germany, Federal Republic of: Bonn	1967 April 23-26	Johnson
Germany, Federal Republic of: Cologne, Bonn, Berlin	1969 February 26-27	Nixon
Germany, Federal Republic of: Bonn, Linz	1975 July 26-28	Ford
Germany, Federal Republic of: Bonn, Wiesbaden-Erbenheim Air Base, Frankfurt, [REDACTED]	1978 July 13-15	Carter
Germany, Federal Republic of: Bonn	1978 July 16-17	Carter

<u>COUNTRY VISITED</u>	<u>DATE OF VISIT</u>	<u>PRESIDENT</u>
Germany, Federal Republic of: Bonn, Berlin	1982 June 9-11	Reagan
Greece: Athens	1959 December 14-15	Eisenhower
Guatemala: Guatemala City	1968 July 8	Johnson
Haiti: Cap Haitien	1934 July 5	Roosevelt, F. D
Honduras: Amapala	1928 November 26	Hoover (E)
Honduras: San Pedro Sula	1968 July 8	Johnson
Honduras: San Pedro Sula	1982 December 4	Reagan
Iceland: Reykjavik	1973 May 31-June 1	Nixon
India: New Delhi, Agra	1959 December 9-14	Eisenhower
India: New Delhi	1969 July 31-August 1	Nixon
India: New Delhi, Daulatpur- Nasirabad	1978 January 1-3	Carter
Indonesia: Jakarta	1969 July 27-28	Nixon

-72

NATIONAL SECURITY COUNCIL
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20506

3933
Add-on

May 27, 1987

MEMORANDUM TO RHETT DAWSON

FROM: GRANT GREEN 

SUBJECT: Presidential Address: Brandenburg Gate

We understand that consideration is being given to forwarding the Brandenburg Address to the President this evening or first thing tomorrow. You may recall that we provided an initial draft to the Speechwriters on April 28 and have subsequently discussed our views with them several times.

In reviewing the revised draft it is clear that serious differences still remain. We have only had a short time to review the revised draft, and our comments are accordingly brief. As you will see from the thrust of our comments, we do not concur with the speech being forwarded to the President in its current form. We will provide more detailed comments later tomorrow.

Attachment
Tab A Comments on Revised Draft

cc: Tom Griscom
Tony Dolan

DC

Teresa

WHITE HOUSE STAFFING MEMORANDUM

DATE: 5/27/87

ACTION/CONCURRENCE/COMMENT DUE BY: COB TODAY

SUBJECT: PRESIDENTIAL ADDRESS: BRANDENBURG GATE (REVISED)
 (5/27 - 1:30 pm draft)

	ACTION FYI			ACTION FYI	
VICE PRESIDENT	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	FITZWATER	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
BAKER	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	GRISCOM	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
DUBERSTEIN	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	HENKEL	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
MILLER - OMB	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	HOBBS	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
BALL	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	KING	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
BAUER	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	MASENG	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
CARLUCCI	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	RISQUE	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
CRIBB	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	RYAN	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
CRIPPEN	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	SPRINKEL	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
CULVAHOUSE	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	TUTTLE	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
DAWSON	<input type="checkbox"/> P	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> SS	DOLAN	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
DONATELLI	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

REMARKS: Please provide any comments on the attached revised address directly to Tony Dolan by close of business today, with an info copy to my office. Thank you.

Peter -

RESPONSE:

My word suggestions

Doris

(Robinson/ARD)
May 27, 1987
1:30 p.m.

PRESIDENTIAL ADDRESS: BRANDENBURG GATE
WEST BERLIN, GERMANY
JUNE 12, 1987

President von Weizsaecker, Chancellor Kohl, Governing Mayor Diepgen, ladies and gentlemen: __ years ago, Harry Truman became the first American President to visit Berlin, speaking to the people of this city and the world at _____. Since then, __ Presidents have come, each in his turn, to Berlin. Today I myself make my second visit to your city.

We come to Berlin, we American Presidents, because it is our duty to speak, in this place, of freedom. But I must confess, we are drawn here by other things as well: By the feeling of history in this city, more than 500 years older than our own Nation. By the sense of energy in your streets. By the beauty of the Grunwald and Tiergarten. Above all, by your courage and friendship.

Perhaps Marlene Dietrich understood something about American Presidents. You see, like so many Presidents before me, I come here today because wherever I go, whatever I do: "Ich hab noch einen koffer in Berlin." ["I still have a suitcase in Berlin" -- words from a much-loved song.]

Our gathering today is being broadcast throughout Western Europe and North America. I understand that it is being broadcast as well in the East -- that Berlin television can be seen as far to the southeast as Prague, as far to the northeast as Gdansk; that Berlin radio can be picked up as far due east as Moscow.

To those listening throughout Eastern Europe, I extend my warmest greetings and the goodwill of the American people. To those listening in East Berlin, a special word. Although I cannot be with you, I address my remarks to you just as surely as to those standing here before me. For I join you as I join your fellow citizens in the West in this firm, this unalterable belief: [In German:] There is only one Berlin.

Behind me stands a wall that divides the entire continent of Europe. From the Baltic to the Harz Mountains it cuts across Germany in one continuous gash of concrete, barbed wire, guard towers, dog runs, and gun emplacements. In places farther south, there may be no visible, no obvious wall. But there remain armed guards and checkpoints all the same -- still a restriction on the right to travel, still an instrument to impose upon ordinary men and women the will of a totalitarian state.

Yet it is here in Berlin where the wall emerges most clearly; here, cutting across your city, where the newsphoto and the television screen have imprinted this brutal division of a continent upon the mind of the world. Standing before the Brandenburg Gate, any man is a German, separated from his fellow men. Any man is a Berliner, forced to look upon a scar.

President von Weizsaecker has said: The German question is open as long as the Brandenburg Gate is closed. Today I say: As long as this gate is closed, as long as this scar of a wall is permitted to stand, it is not the German question alone that remains open, but the question of freedom for all mankind.

Yet I do not come here to lament. For I find in Berlin a message of hope -- even, in the shadow of this wall, a message of triumph.

"*is June Spring*"²

In this season of spring in 1945, the people of Berlin emerged from their air-raid shelters to find devastation. Streets choked with rubble. One building in five destroyed. Eighty thousand lying dead. Thousands of miles away, the people of the United States reached out to help. In announcing the Marshall Plan, Secretary of State George Marshall stated precisely 40 years ago this week: "Our policy is directed not against any country or doctrine, but against hunger, poverty, desperation, and chaos."

In the Reichstag a few moments ago, I saw a display commemorating this 40th anniversary of the Marshall Plan. I was struck by the sign on a burnt-out, gutted structure that was being rebuilt. I understand that Berliners of my own generation can remember seeing signs like it dotted throughout the Western sectors of the city. The sign read simply: "The Marshall Plan at work. For the building of a Free World."

"[T]he building of a Free World" -- in the West, that building took place. Japan rose from ruin to become an economic giant. Italy, France, Belgium -- each saw political and economic rebirth.

In the Federal Republic of Germany, there took place an economic miracle, the "Wirtschaftswunder." Adenauer, Erhard, and others understood the practical importance of liberty -- that just as truth can flourish only when the journalist is given

freedom of speech, so prosperity can come about only when the farmer and businessman enjoy economic freedom. The German leaders reduced tariffs, expanded free trade, lowered taxes. From 1950 to 1960 alone, the standard of living in the Federal Republic more than doubled.

Here in Berlin there took place a transformation. Where four decades ago there was rubble, today there is the greatest industrial output of any city in Germany; busy office blocks; fine homes and apartments; proud avenues and the spreading lawns of parkland. Where a city's culture seemed to have been destroyed, today there are two universities, an opera and a philharmonic orchestra, countless theaters and museums. Where there was want, today there is abundance -- food, clothing, automobiles; the luxury goods of the Ku'damm; even home computers.

From the rubble -- from the utter ruin -- you Berliners have in freedom rebuilt a city that once again ranks as one of the greatest on Earth. The Soviets may have had other plans. But, my friends, there was one thing the Soviets didn't count on: Berliner schnauze. Ja, Berliner schnauze -- und mit herz. ["Berliner schnauze" is a well-known phrase meaning courage mixed with good humor, "chutzpah." "Und mit herz" means "and with heart."]

Soon after the War, Khrushchev predicted: "We will bury you." Yet, in the West today, we see a free world that has achieved a level of prosperity and well-being unprecedented in all human history. While in the East -- in the East, we see

technological backwardness. Declining standards of health. Even want of the most basic kind -- too little food. The Soviet Union still cannot feed itself. In East Germany, at harvest time the news announcers still speak, to use the well-known phrase, of "the battle to bring in the crops."

After these four decades, then, there stands before the entire world one great and inescapable conclusion. Totalitarianism? Totalitarianism produces failure. Freedom? Freedom leads to prosperity and replaces the ancient hatreds between the nations with comity and peace.

How then are we in the free world to deal with the totalitarian East? Let me say at the outset that I understand the fear of war and the pain of division that afflict this continent. So I pledge my country to peace -- and to the expansion throughout Europe of liberty.

To these ends, we in the West must force the Soviets to deal with their own internal problems, not attempt to flee them by expanding still more. So we must maintain defenses of unassailable strength. And yet it is our nature as free peoples to make manifest our goodwill. So we must strive to reduce arms on both sides.

Just 10 years ago, the Soviets challenged the Western Alliance with a grave new threat: the deployment of hundreds of nuclear missiles, capable of striking every capital in Europe. As the Alliance weighed its response, there were difficult days -- days of protests like those that took place during my 1982 visit to this city.

But the Alliance held firm, moving to counter the Soviet threat. And I invite those who protested then -- I invite those who protest today -- to mark this fact: Because we remained strong, the Soviets came to the table. Because we remained strong, today we are engaged in talks that promise not merely limitations on the growth of arms, but deep and verifiable arms reductions.

As I speak, NATO ministers are meeting in Iceland to consider our proposals for reducing I.N.F.'s, intermediate-range nuclear forces. We have proposed deep cuts in strategic forces at the START talks in Geneva. Indeed, we have proposed sharp cuts in virtually every aspect of the nuclear forces now based in Europe.

Today I will go further.

It is well-known that we in the West require nuclear forces not only to counterbalance Soviet nuclear missiles, but to make up as well for the superiority of Soviet conventional forces virtually throughout Eastern Europe. So today I challenge the Soviets. Those thousands of troops -- those massive conventional forces of all kinds -- that are in place in Eastern Europe not to maintain the military balance but only to secure Soviet domination: Withdraw them. For the sake of arms control -- for the sake of peace in Europe -- withdraw them.

The resolve to defend ourselves, the determination to reduce the nuclear threat -- our Strategic Defense Initiative makes both clear. In East and West alike, today nuclear strategy is based upon the threat of massive retaliation. The Strategic Defense

Initiative holds out the hope of a fundamental change -- the hope that we might soon be able to destroy nuclear missiles aimed at Europe or North America before they strike their targets. As I have stated before, when we develop this technology, we will make it available to the Soviet Union -- the shield-bearer offering a shield to its opponent. The Strategic Defense Initiative will provide Europe, North America, and -- if the Soviets are willing -- the Soviet Union itself, with a defense that truly defends.

The need for strong defenses is of course nowhere more apparent than here in Berlin. Today as in the past, our Nation remains utterly committed to the freedom of the western sectors. The United States will continue to pursue strict observance and full implementation of all parts of the Four Power Agreement of 1971. We intend to work in particular for fuller implementation of the provisions that call for ties between the western sectors of Berlin and the Federal Republic of Germany.

Yet it is possible to speak in Berlin today not only of maintaining defenses, but of launching initiatives. It is possible to speak of Berlin reaching out to the East -- reaching out, to demonstrate to its neighbors the power of freedom. So let us speak to the world of signals of openness and goodwill -- Signals From Berlin.

Governing Mayor Diepgen, as the first signal, I will with your approval propose to the Soviets that at the conclusion of the Vienna Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe, the United States and the Soviet Union hold a second meeting here in

Berlin, alternating between the two parts of the city. As a second signal, I am willing -- I am eager -- to schedule arms control negotiations in the two sectors of this city. Perhaps as a further signal the Berlin Senat could invite the United Nations to hold conferences here in Berlin.

As a signal of immense importance, together with our British and French allies, the United States will in coming weeks negotiate new air corridor agreements for Berlin. These agreements will open Berlin still further to East and West alike.

If you will permit me, one final suggestion. Sport represents a source of enjoyment and ennoblement, and you may have noted that the Republic of Korea -- South Korea -- has offered to permit certain events of the 1988 Olympics to take place in the North. What better way to signal goodwill toward the East -- what better way to signal to the world the openness of this city -- than in some coming year to hold the Olympic Games here in Berlin, East and West?

Perhaps when President Kennedy spoke at the Rudolph Wilde Platz 24 years ago, it was freedom that was encircled, Berlin that was under siege. No longer. Despite all the pressures upon this city, Berlin stands secure in its liberty. And today freedom itself is transforming the globe.

In the Philippines; in Argentina, Brazil, and across Latin America, democracy has been given a rebirth. Throughout the Pacific, free markets are working miracle after miracle of economic growth -- even the Peoples' Republic of China has granted important new freedoms. In the industrialized nations, a

technological revolution is taking place -- a revolution marked by rapid, dramatic advances in computers and telecommunications.

In Europe, only one nation and those it controls refuse to join the community of freedom. Yet in this age of redoubled economic growth, of information and innovation, the Soviet Union faces a choice. It must make fundamental changes. Or it will become obsolete.

The Soviets themselves may be coming to understand this. We hear much from Moscow about a new policy of openness and liberalization -- to use the Russian term, "glasnost." Some political prisoners have been released. B.B.C. broadcasts are no longer jammed. Certain small enterprises have been permitted to operate with greater freedom from state control.

Are these the beginnings of profound changes in the Soviet state? Or are they token gestures, intended in large part to raise false hopes in the West? It is impossible to tell.

But there is one sign the Soviets can make that would be unmistakable.

General Secretary Gorbachev, 15 days ago, you were in Berlin. Now I say to you: If you truly seek peace, come back. If you truly seek prosperity for the Soviet Union and Eastern Europe, come back. If you truly seek liberalization -- if you truly seek "glasnost" -- come back.

Come here, to this gate.

Herr Gorbachev, machen Sie dieses Tor auf. [Mr. Gorbachev, open this gate.] Herr Gorbachev, tear down this wall.

Voice of America

In these four decades, as I have said, you Berliners have rebuilt a great city. You have done so in spite of threats: The Soviet attempts to impose the East-mark. The blockade. Today the city thrives in spite of the challenge implicit in the very presence of this wall.

What keeps you here? What persuades you to stay when you could so easily travel to the West? I spoke earlier of "Berliner schnauze," and of course there is a great deal to be said for your fortitude, for your defiant courage.

But I believe that there is something deeper. Something that involves Berlin's whole look and feel and way of life. Not mere sentiment -- no one could live long in Berlin without being completely disabused of illusions. Something instead, something that sees the difficulties of life in Berlin but chooses to accept them. That stubbornly refuses to abandon this good and proud city to a surrounding presence that is merely brutish. Something that speaks with a voice of powerful affirmation -- that says yes to this city, yes to the future, yes to freedom. In a word, I would submit that what keeps you in Berlin is love -- love both profound and abiding.

Perhaps this gets to the root of the matter, to the most fundamental distinction of all between East and West. The totalitarian world does not produce low living standards and backwardness because of some technical shortcoming in its economic arrangements. It produces backwardness because it does such violence to the spirit, thwarting the human impulse to create, to enjoy, to worship.

The totalitarian world finds even symbols of love an affront. During the War, the sculpture atop the Brandenburg Gate was taken down for safekeeping and stored here, in the Western sectors of the city. In 19__, the West turned the sculpture over to the East in a gesture of goodwill, and soon the sculpture was once again looking out upon "Unter den Linden" [the main avenue in East Berlin]. But something was different. The cross -- the cross the figure had borne aloft for nearly 150 years -- that cross was gone. In its place was a Communist wreath.

__ years later, authorities in the East erected what is now the tallest structure in the city, the television tower above Alexanderplatz. I understand that virtually ever since, the authorities have been working to correct what they view as the tower's one major flaw, treating the glass dome at the top with paints and chemicals of every kind. Yet even today when the sun strikes that dome -- that dome that towers over all Berlin -- the light makes the sign of the cross.

As I looked out a moment ago from the Reichstag -- that embodiment of German unity -- I noticed words crudely spray-painted upon the wall -- perhaps by a young Berliner -- words that answer the German question. "This wall will fall. Beliefs become reality."

And freedom will prevail?

Yes, across Europe, this wall will fall. For in the end it cannot withstand faith. It cannot withstand truth.

Die Mauer kann Freiheit nicht zuruckhalten. [The wall cannot withstand freedom.]

Thank you. God bless you all.