This is a copy of the fixes I passed to Tom around lunchtime today. He seemed to like some but had problems with others. WHC

November 21, 1987
5:00 p.m.

Proposed NSC Fixes

PRESIDENTIAL ADDRESS: SDI/INF
MARTIN-MARIETTA PLANT
DENVER, COLORADO
TUESDAY, NOVEMBER 24, 1987

Thank you. And thank you Mr. Pownall and General Abrahamson. It is an honor for me to be at Martin-Marietta with all of you, men and women of science and engineering, who play such a vital role in this age of technology. I will have to admit I'm a bit awed by what I've seen and heard today.

Of course, not all my predecessors shared my sense of wonder about such things. One, President Rutherford B. Hayes played host to a notable science and technology event back in ~~1876~~ the 1870s -- a demonstration ~~in the White House~~ of the newly invented telephone. President Hayes' reaction: "That's an amazing invention," he said, "but who would ever want to use them?" (PAUSE) When I heard him say that, I thought he might be mistaken.

Seriously though, I was born in a small town in the farm country of Illinois. Progress in those days meant indoor plumbing, electric lights, a telephone, and perhaps a radio crystal set. Just in my lifetime, we've gone from a time when many, if not most, people traveled by horse power -- and I mean the kind that eats hay -- to an era of supersonic passenger service. And just possibly before I leave the scene, we will have developed a craft that will take off from runways as planes do today, but once at high altitude, this craft will rocket itself into space and zip to its destination at ~~four~~ 18 or ~~five~~ 20

times the speed of sound -- from New York to Tokyo in 90 minutes. (PAUSE) This could bring a whole new meaning for "sushi to go."

The America I was born into was acclaimed for its liberty and opportunity, yet that opportunity for which we were so proud has been expanded today beyond anything the Americans of my youth could possibly have imagined. Affordable world-wide communications and transportation have not just extended, but eliminated horizons. Computer capability, which a short time ago was available only to large corporations, is now being put to use by small business and individual entrepreneurs.

We are in an age when the common man can do and experience what in past times was enjoyed only by kings, royalty, and the elite. Jefferson, Washington, and Madison laid the foundation for liberty and equality; Edison, Einstein, Goddard, and others like them, like many of you, built on that foundation. It has been technology and freedom, together, that have pushed America ever forward and made her the land of abundance and progress we love so dearly.

~~British statesman~~ Arthur Balfour once noted, "Science is the greatest instrument of social change... the most vital of all revolutions which marked the development of modern civilizations."

Science and technological-based revolutions in health care, food production, communications, transportation, manufacturing, and other endeavors have changed how we live and the quality of our lives. Before joining you, I was given a classified update on some of the key elements of the program you're working on.

It's clear that the project is bounding forward and I couldn't be more pleased. After what I have seen today, I believe that mankind is again on the edge of a revolution that will change the basic assumptions upon which we base our decisions and reshape the world in which we live.

Until now, mankind's search for security often focused on expanding the ability to lash out, to kill, to destroy. Technological advances throughout the ages increased man's destructive power, and those nations that did not keep pace soon felt the sting of defeat and the pain of subjugation. But humanity, in almost every case found a defense for every offense, and that is exactly what we are seeking: a defense against mankind's most deadly weapons: ballistic missiles.

You are laboring to develop a defensive system that will change history. Once you've completed your work, the world will never be the same. I suggest it will be a better and a safer world. And what better legacy can this generation leave than a safer world?

Our Strategic Defense Initiative offers mankind security through protection rather than the threat of retaliation. It is a scientific advance that will be judged a success based not on how many lives it is capable of ~~taking~~ threatening -- which is none -- but on how many it is able to protect. It is a moral as well as scientific endeavor worth every minute and hour you are dedicating to it. Our goal is to strengthen deterrence by moving as soon as we are ready to increasing reliance on defenses to keep the peace.

I realize that being a government project, with all the politics that goes with that reality, your work can be frustrating. Wernher von Braun once said, "We can lick gravity, but sometimes the paperwork is overwhelming."

I appreciate the extraordinary effort each of you is making. Your mental prowess and creativity, and, yes, your hard work, will make or break the program. And I want you to know, what you accomplish will be put to good use in protecting your country, the free world, and perhaps all mankind against the threat of nuclear holocaust. You are not working to build a bargaining chip. It will not be traded away.

Yes, there are those who complain about the cost. Benjamin Franklin, himself a man of science and politics, once observed, "The expenses required to prevent a war are much lighter than those that will, if not prevented, be absolutely necessary to maintain it."

Well, mirroring that thought, I'd say that what we spend to protect ourselves from nuclear missiles is much lighter than the cost, human and otherwise, if even one nuclear missile is fired, even if by mistake, and we have to suffer the consequences because there is no way to stop it. In the case of S.D.I., America cannot afford <u>not</u> to do everything necessary to develop this missile defense system and put it into operation.

The Soviet Union, even as they criticize and try to cripple our S.D.I. research effort, has been aggressively moving ahead on its own anti-ballistic missile defense. They ~~are~~ have spent ~~spending many~~ roughly 200 billions of dollars ~~20 times more than we have~~ in the last

Accuracy

Yes

10 years -- and have concentrated the energy and talent of their brightest scientific minds. More than 10,000 skilled Soviet scientists and engineers are working on military lasers alone -- with thousands more developing high-tech weapons that use particle beams and kinetic energy. In contrast, we have spent less than 10 billion dollars since the SDI program began in 1983.

The Soviet government wages its propaganda campaign against our S.D.I. research, even while they work overtime to develop their own S.D.I.-like system. We must not be lulled into reducing our commitment. Their military program, which includes everything from killer-satellites to the modernized anti-missile system that protects Moscow, dwarfs our S.D.I. program already. Those who would cut or eliminate funds for our effort would grant a clear monopoly in this vital area to our adversary, which would undermine the present basis of deterrence. Because the question is not, will strategic defenses be developed? The question is rather, will the Soviet Union be the only country to possess them? The choice is ours.

Furthermore, the Strategic Defense Initiative is not aimed at protecting us and our allies against the Soviet Union alone. Francis Bacon once wrote, "He that will not apply new remedies must expect new evils; for time is the greatest innovator." Well, in the decades ahead, who knows what governments will obtain ballistic missile technology? Who knows how rational or competent those governments will be. I spoke before a meeting of the American Council of Life Insurance last week and I called S.D.I. an insurance policy. And that's what it is.

S.D.I. is not a weapon of war, but an insurer, a protector, of the peace. It is totally within the limits of the A.B.M.

treaty. Let me add, the United States has observed the A.B.M. treaty, but with the construction of the huge phased-array radar at Krasnoyarsk the Soviets have violated one of the treaty's ~~key~~ key provisions. This is but another example of why it's important not to rely on words alone. The Strategic Defense Initiative, you see, (helped bring the Soviets back to the negotiating table and) underwrites our efforts to achieve offensive arms reduction agreements. With a defensive system in place, the possibility that one side has cheated, and has a few missiles in hiding, is far less threatening. S.D.I., then, makes further reductions more likely. A system that makes ballistic missiles less effective, makes those missiles more negotiable.

Now there are those who may be pessimistic about the chances of deep reductions in U.S. and Soviet ~~the~~ nuclear arsenals, but let us not forget that in 1981, when I first proposed our zero option in INF, it too was all but written off by many commentators. In the time that has followed, we persevered and stuck to our principles. We held firm against the advocates of a so-called nuclear freeze. We followed through on our modernization program and in close cooperation with our allies, installed the Cruise and Pershings in Europe. When at long last it was realized that we in the alliance had the courage to protect our own long-run interests, progress toward a mutually beneficial treaty ensued.

As you are all aware, General Secretary Gorbachev will be visiting Washington beginning December 7th. If the last-minute details can be worked out, we hope to sign an historic treaty that will eliminate a whole class of U.S. and Soviet nuclear-armed intermediate-range missiles from the face of the

NO

Earth, the first mutually agreed upon reduction in our nuclear arsenals ever.

But the Soviets have to drop their tactic of holding strategic offensive reductions hostage to their efforts to cripple SDI.

And this could well be just a beginning. We hope we can see forward movement on a number of other fronts. The United States, for example, has proposed a 50-percent reduction in U.S.-Soviet Offensive Strategic Forces. Much progress has been made toward a START agreement and more is possible. But let there be no doubt, giving up ~~the Strategic Defense Initiative and~~ the protection SDI will provide is too high a price for any agreement. We therefore have made clear to the Soviets that we won't accept restrictions on defenses that go beyond those actually agreed in the ABM Treaty.

Neither the I.N.F. treaty we hope to sign during the upcoming summit, nor any other agreement that follows, will be built on trust. Agreements with the Soviet Union must be based on reciprocity, effective verification, and realism. And while we want to bolster the peace and do our part to improve relations, no agreement should ever be signed simply for the sake of signing an agreement, for the sake of atmospherics. Improving the general tone of relations between our countries, as I've outlined on several occasions, will require a much more ~~constructive Soviet policy~~ movement from the other side toward the solution of regional conflicts, a far greater respect for human rights within the Soviet Union, and progress on a number of bilateral issues between our countries. As I've explained to General Secretary Gorbachev, our countries do not have differences because we are well-armed, we are well-armed because we have differences.

NO Accuracy/Policy

Policy yes

Policy yes

Even with all the talk of openness and Glasnost, much change needs to take place before trust, like that we have with democratic governments, can come into play. The Soviet peoples themselves -- even though there has been some change -- still

tell stories and joke about their plight. I heard one about a fellow who went to the K.G.B. to report that he lost his parrot. The K.G.B. asked him why he was bothering them. Why didn't he just report it to the local police. He answered, "I just want you to know, I don't agree with a thing that parrot has to say."

In 4 months, we will mark the 5th anniversary of the March 23, 1983, speech in which I challenged the scientific community to develop a system that would make ballistic missiles obsolete. General George Patton once said, "Never tell people how to do things; tell them what to do, and they will surprise you with their ingenuity." That statement showed a deep insight into the American character, and it has been proven again in our drive to ~~develop~~ establish a strategic defense system.

Today, I have been deeply impressed with what I've seen and heard. The progress made toward achieving our goals ~~has been even faster than we expected~~ gives us reason for confidence. ~~nothing less than astounding~~. The critics who claimed it couldn't be done have been proven wrong again -- just has been the case with almost every technological triumph in the past. The scientific research and engineering work you are doing, along with that of others like you in hundreds of locations throughout this great land, is a tribute to the genius of America. This is truly a national effort -- both government and private sector -- involving pre-eminent individuals in industry, education, and the scientific community. No President could be prouder or more grateful than I am for all you, and your fellow colleagues around the country, are doing. God bless you.

Source Copy

(Rohrabacher/ARD)
November 19, 1987
6:30 p.m.

PRESIDENTIAL ADDRESS: SDI/INF
MARTIN-MARIETTA PLANT
DENVER, COLORADO
TUESDAY, NOVEMBER 24, 1987

Thank you. It is an honor for me to be with all of you, men and women of science and engineering, who play such a vital role in this age of technology. I will have to admit I'm a bit awed by what I've seen and heard today.

Of course, not all my predecessors shared my sense of wonder about such things. One, President Rutherford. B. Hayes played host to a notable science and technology event back in 1876 -- a demonstration in the White House of the newly invented telephone. President Hayes's reaction: "That's an amazing invention," he said, "but who would ever want to use them?" (PAUSE) I thought at the time I heard him say that he might be mistaken.

Seriously though, I was born into a small town in the farm country of Illinois. Progress in those days meant indoor plumbing, electric lights, a telephone, and perhaps a radio crystal set. Just in my life, we've gone from a time when many, if not most, people traveled by horsepower -- and I mean the kind that eats hay -- to an era of supersonic passenger service. And just possibly before I leave the scene, we will have developed a craft that will takeoff from runways as planes do today, but once at high altitude, this craft will rocket itself into space and zip to its destination at 4 or 5 times the speed of sound -- from New York to Tokyo in 90 minutes. (PAUSE) This could bring a whole new meaning for "sushi to go."

The America I was born into was acclaimed for its liberty and opportunity, yet that opportunity for which we were so proud has been expanded today beyond anything the Americans of my youth could possibly have imagined. Affordable world-wide communications and transportation have not just extended, but eliminated horizons. Computer capability, which a short time ago was available only to large corporations, is now being put to use by small business and individual entrepreneurs.

We are in an age when the common man can do and experience what in past times was enjoyed only by kings, royalty, and the elite. Jefferson, Washington, and Madison laid the foundation for liberty and equality; Edison, Einstein, Goddard, and others like them, like many of you, built on that foundation. It has been technology and freedom, together, that have pushed America ever forward and made her the land of abundance and progress we love so dearly.

British statesman Arthur Balfour once noted, "Science is the greatest instrument of social change... the most vital of all revolutions which marked the development of modern civilizations."

Science and technological based revolutions in health care, food production, communications, transportation, manufacturing, and other endeavors have changed how we live and the quality of our lives. After what I have seen today, I believe that mankind is again on the edge of a revolution that will change the basic assumptions upon which we base our decisions and reshape the world in which we live.

Until now, mankind's search for security focused on expanding the ability to lash out, to kill, to destroy. Technological advances throughout the ages increased man's destructive power and those nations that did not keep pace soon felt the sting of defeat and the pain of subjugation. This has been a fact of life. What you are doing here, is changing the facts of life and once you've completed your work the world will never be the same. I suggest it will be a better and a safer world.

Our Strategic Defense Initiative offers mankind security through protection rather than retaliation. It is a scientific advance that will be judged a success not on how many lives it is capable of taking, but on how many it is able to save. It is a moral as well as scientific endeavor worth every minute and hour you are dedicating to it.

I realize that being a government project, with all the politics that goes with that reality, your work can be frustrating. Wernher von Braun once said, "We can lick gravity, but sometimes the paperwork is overwhelming."

I appreciate the extraordinary effort each of you is putting into this project. Your mental prowess and creativity, and, yes, your hard work, will make or break the program. And I want you to know, what you accomplish will be put to good use in protecting your country, the free world, and perhaps all mankind against the threat of nuclear holocaust. It is not a bargaining chip. It will not be traded away.

Yes, there are those who complain about the cost. Benjamin Franklin, himself a man of science and politics, once observed, "The expenses required to prevent a war are much lighter than those that will, if not prevented, be absolutely necessary to maintain it."

Well, mirroring that thought, I'd say that what we spend to protect ourselves from nuclear missiles is much lighter than the cost will be, human and otherwise, if even one nuclear missile is fired, even if by mistake, and we have to suffer the consequences because there is no way to stop it. In the case of S.D.I., America cannot afford not to do everything necessary to develop this missile defense system and put it in operation.

The Soviet Union, even as they criticize our S.D.I. research effort, have been rushing full steam ahead on their own anti-ballistic missile defense. They are spending billions of dollars, perhaps tens of billions, and have concentrated the energy and talent of their brightest scientific minds. More than 10,000 scientists are working on military lasers alone -- with thousands more developing high-tech weapons that use particle beams and kinetic energy.

The Soviet government's propaganda campaign against our S.D.I. research, even while they work overtime to develop their own S.D.I.-like system, is one of the greatest con games in history. We must not be conned into reducing our commitment. Their "Cosmos" weapons program, which includes everything from killer-satellites to the modernized anti-missile system that protects Moscow, dwarfs our S.D.I. program already. Those who

would cut or eliminate funds to our effort, in doing so would grant a monopoly in this vital area to the Soviet Union.

Furthermore, the Strategic Defense Initiative is not aimed at protecting us and our allies against the Soviet Union alone. Francis Bacon once wrote, "He that will not apply new remedies must expect new evils; for time is the greatest innovator." Well, in the decades ahead who knows what governments will obtain long-range missiles? Who knows how rational or competent those governments will be? I spoke before a meeting of the America Council of Life Insurance last week and I called S.D.I. an insurance policy. And that's what it is.

Nov 16, 1987

S.D.I. is not a weapon of war, but an insurer, a protector, of the peace. It is totally within the limits as set by the A.B.M. treaty and we intend to continue our compliance with that agreement. In fact, the huff and puff of the Kremlin notwithstanding, I believe that the Strategic Defense Initiative compliments our efforts to achieve missile reduction agreements. With a defensive system in place, the possibility that one side has cheated, and has a few missiles in hiding, is far less frightening. S.D.I., then, makes deeper reductions more likely. A system that makes nuclear-armed missiles more vulnerable, makes those missiles more negotiable.

Now there are those who may be pessimistic about chances of deep reductions in the nuclear arsenals, but let us not forget that in 1981, when I first proposed our zero option, it too was all but written off by the commentators -- not all of them, but many of them. In the time that has followed, we persevered and

stuck to our principles. We held firm against the advocates of a so-called nuclear freeze, followed through on our modernization program, and the installation of Cruise and Pershings in Europe. When at long last it was realized that we would not accept the nuclear domination of Europe by the Soviet Union, that we had the courage to protect our own long-run interests and those of the alliance, progress toward a mutually beneficial treaty ensued.

As you are all aware, General Secretary Gorbachev, will be visiting Washington beginning December 7th. If the last minute details can be worked out, we hope to sign an historic treaty which will eliminate a whole class of nuclear-armed intermediate-range missiles from the face of the Earth, the first mutually agreed upon reduction in our nuclear arsenals ever.

As I say, this will be a history making event, yet it is only a first step, a model for others that will follow. We would hope to see progress on a number of fronts. The United States, for example, has proposed a 50 percent reduction in the number of longer-range nuclear-armed missiles. We are also looking for an agreement on chemical and biological weapons, and a reduction on both sides of the conventional military forces facing each other on the European continent.

Neither the I.N.F. treaty we hope to be signed during the upcoming summit, nor any other agreement that follows will be built on trust. Agreements with the Soviet Union must be based on reciprocity, verification, and realism. And while we want to bolster the peace and improve relations, no agreement should ever be signed simply for the sake of signing an agreement, for the

sake of atmospherics. Improving the general tone of relations between our countries, as I've outlined on several occasions, will require much more movement toward solutions in regional conflicts, a greater respect for human rights within the Soviet Union, and progress on a number of bilateral issues between our countries. As I've explained to General Secretary Gorbachev, our countries do not have differences because we are well-armed, we are well-armed because we have differences.

Even with all the talk of openness and Glasnost, much change needs to take place before trust, like that we have with democratic governments, can come into play. The Soviet peoples, themselves -- even though there has been some change -- still tell stories and joke about their plight. I heard one about a fellow who went to the K.G.B. to report that he lost his parrot. The K.G.B. asked him why he was bothering them. Why didn't he just report it to the local police. He answered, "I just want you to know, I don't agree with a thing that parrot has to say."

In 4 months we will mark the 5th anniversary of the March 23, 1983 speech in which I challenged the scientific community to develop a system that would make nuclear-armed missiles obsolete. General George Patton once said, "Never tell people how to do things; tell them what to do, and they will surprise you with their ingenuity." That statement showed a deep insight into the American character and it has been proven again in our drive for a nuclear defense system.

Today, I have been deeply impressed with what I've seen and heard. The scientific research and engineering work you are

doing, along with that of others like you in hundred of locations throughout this great land, is a tribute to the genius of America. This is truly a national effort -- both government and private sector -- involving pre-eminent individuals in industry, education, and the scientific community. No President could be prouder or more grateful than I am for all you, and your fellow colleagues around the country, are doing. God bless you.

(Rohrabacher/ARD)
November 21, 1987
4:30 p.m.

PRESIDENTIAL ADDRESS: SDI/INF
MARTIN-MARIETTA PLANT
DENVER, COLORADO
TUESDAY, NOVEMBER 24, 1987

Thank you. And thank you Mr. Pownall and General Abrahamson. It is an honor for me to be at Martin-Marietta with all of you, men and women of science and engineering, who play such a vital role in this age of technology. I will have to admit I'm a bit awed by what I've seen and heard today.

Of course, not all my predecessors shared my sense of wonder about such things. One, President Rutherford B. Hayes played host to a notable science and technology event back in 1876 -- a demonstration in the White House of the newly invented telephone. President Hayes' reaction: "That's an amazing invention," he said, "but who would ever want to use them?" (PAUSE) When I heard him say that, I thought he might be mistaken.

Seriously though, I was born in a small town in the farm country of Illinois. Progress in those days meant indoor plumbing, electric lights, a telephone, and perhaps a radio crystal set. Just in my lifetime, we've gone from a time when many, if not most, people traveled by horse power -- and I mean the kind that eats hay -- to an era of supersonic passenger service. And just possibly before I leave the scene, we will have developed a craft that will take off from runways as planes do today, but once at high altitude, this craft will rocket itself into space and zip to its destination at four or five times the speed of sound -- from New York to Tokyo in 90 minutes. (PAUSE) This could bring a whole new meaning for "sushi to go."

The America I was born into was acclaimed for its liberty and opportunity, yet that opportunity for which we were so proud has been expanded today beyond anything the Americans of my youth could possibly have imagined. Affordable world-wide communications and transportation have not just extended, but eliminated horizons. Computer capability, which a short time ago was available only to large corporations, is now being put to use by small business and individual entrepreneurs.

We are in an age when the common man can do and experience what in past times was enjoyed only by kings, royalty, and the elite. Jefferson, Washington, and Madison laid the foundation for liberty and equality; Edison, Einstein, Goddard, and others like them, like many of you, built on that foundation. It has been technology and freedom, together, that have pushed America ever forward and made her the land of abundance and progress we love so dearly.

British statesman Arthur Balfour once noted, "Science is the greatest instrument of social change... the most vital of all revolutions which marked the development of modern civilizations."

Science and technological-based revolutions in health care, food production, communications, transportation, manufacturing, and other endeavors have changed how we live and the quality of our lives. Before joining you, I was given a classified update on some of the key elements of the program you're working on. It's clear that the project is bounding forward and I couldn't be more pleased. After what I have seen today, I believe that

mankind is again on the edge of a revolution that will change the basic assumptions upon which we base our decisions and reshape the world in which we live.

Until now, mankind's search for security often focused on expanding the ability to lash out, to kill, to destroy. Technological advances throughout the ages increased man's destructive power, and those nations that did not keep pace soon felt the sting of defeat and the pain of subjugation. But humanity, ~~also has almost always~~ in almost every case, found a defense for every offense, and that is exactly what we are seeking: a defense against mankind's most deadly weapons, ballistic missiles.

You are laboring to develop a defensive system that will change history. Once you've completed your work, the world will never be the same. I suggest it will be a better and a safer world. And what better legacy can this generation leave than a safer world?

Our Strategic Defense Initiative offers mankind security through protection rather than retaliation. It is a scientific advance that will be judged a success based not on how many lives it is capable of taking -- which is none -- but on how many it is able to protect. It is a moral as well as scientific endeavor worth every minute and hour you are dedicating to it. Our goal is to strengthen deterrence by moving as soon as we are ready to increasing reliance on defenses to keep the peace.

I realize that being a government project, with all the politics that goes with that reality, your work can be

frustrating. Wernher von Braun once said, "We can lick gravity, but sometimes the paperwork is overwhelming."

I appreciate the extraordinary effort each of you is making. Your mental prowess and creativity, and, yes, your hard work, will make or break the program. And I want you to know, what you accomplish will be put to good use in protecting your country, the free world, and perhaps all mankind against the threat of nuclear holocaust. You are not working to build a bargaining chip. It will not be traded away.

Yes, there are those who complain about the cost. Benjamin Franklin, himself a man of science and politics, once observed, "The expenses required to prevent a war are much lighter than those that will, if not prevented, be absolutely necessary to maintain it."

Well, mirroring that thought, I'd say that what we spend to protect ourselves from nuclear missiles is much lighter than the cost, human and otherwise, if even one nuclear missile is fired, even if by mistake, and we have to suffer the consequences because there is no way to stop it. In the case of S.D.I., America cannot afford <u>not</u> to do everything necessary to develop this missile defense system and put it into operation.

The Soviet Union, even as they criticize and try to cripple our S.D.I. research effort, has been aggressively moving ahead on its own anti-ballistic missile defense. They are spending many billions of dollars -- 20 times more than we have in the last 10 years -- and have concentrated the energy and talent of their brightest scientific minds. More than 10,000 skilled scientists

and engineers are working on military lasers alone -- with thousands more developing high-tech weapons that use particle beams and kinetic energy.

The Soviet government wages its propaganda campaign against our S.D.I. research, even while they work overtime to develop their own S.D.I.-like system. We must not be lulled into reducing our commitment. Their military program, which includes everything from killer-satellites to the modernized anti-missile system that protects Moscow, dwarfs our S.D.I. program already. Those who would cut or eliminate funds for our effort would grant a clear monopoly in this vital area to our adversary. Because the question is not, will strategic defenses be developed? The question is rather, will the Soviet Union be the only country to possess them? The choice is ours.

Furthermore, the Strategic Defense Initiative is not aimed at protecting us and our allies against the Soviet Union alone. Francis Bacon once wrote, "He that will not apply new remedies must expect new evils; for time is the greatest innovator." Well, in the decades ahead, who knows what governments will obtain ballistic missile technology? Who knows how rational or competent those governments will be. I spoke before a meeting of the American Council of Life Insurance last week and I called S.D.I. an insurance policy. And that's what it is.

S.D.I. is not a weapon of war, but an insurer, a protector, of the peace. It is totally within the limits ~~agreed~~ of to in the A.B.M. treaty. Let me add, the United States has observed the A.B.M. treaty, but with the construction of the huge phased-array

radar at Krasnoyarsk the Soviets have violated one of the treaty's lay provisions. That's why it's important not to rely on words alone. The Strategic Defense Initiative, you see, underwrites our efforts to achieve offensive arms reduction agreements. With a defensive system in place, the possibility that one side has cheated, and has a few missiles in hiding, is far less threatening. S.D.I., then, makes further reductions more likely. A system that makes ballistic missiles less effective, makes those missiles more negotiable.

Now there are those who may be pessimistic about the chances of deep reductions in the nuclear arsenals, but let us not forget that in 1981, when I first proposed our zero option, it too was all but written off by many commentators. In the time that has followed, we persevered and stuck to our principles. We held firm against the advocates of a so-called nuclear freeze. We followed through on our modernization program and in close cooperation with our allies, installed the Cruise and Pershings in Europe. When at long last it was realized that we in the alliance had the courage to protect our own long-run interests, progress toward a mutually beneficial treaty ensued.

As you are all aware, General Secretary Gorbachev will be visiting Washington beginning December 7th. If the last-minute details can be worked out, we hope to sign an historic treaty that will eliminate a whole class of U.S. and Soviet nuclear-armed intermediate-range missiles from the face of the Earth, the first mutually agreed upon reduction in our nuclear arsenals ever.

And this could well be just a beginning. We ~~would~~ hope ~~to~~ we can see ~~progress~~ forward movement on a number of other fronts. The United States, for example, has proposed a 50-percent reduction in U.S.-Soviet Offensive Strategic Forces. Much progress has been made toward a START agreement and more is possible. But let there be no doubt, giving up the Strategic Defense Initiative and the protection it will provide is too high a price for any agreement.

Neither the I.N.F. treaty we hope to sign during the upcoming summit, nor any other agreement that follows, will be built on trust. Agreements with the Soviet Union must be based on reciprocity, verification, and realism. And while we want to bolster the peace and improve relations, no agreement should ever be signed simply for the sake of signing an agreement, for the sake of atmospherics. Improving the general tone of relations between our countries, as I've outlined on several occasions, will require much more movement toward the solution of regional conflicts, a far greater respect for human rights within the Soviet Union, and progress on a number of bilateral issues between our countries. As I've explained to General Secretary Gorbachev, our countries do not have differences because we are well-armed, we are well-armed because we have differences.

Even with all the talk of openness and Glasnost, much change needs to take place before trust, like that we have with democratic governments, can come into play. The Soviet peoples themselves -- even though there has been some change -- still tell stories and joke about their plight. I heard one about a fellow who went to the K.G.B. to report that he lost his parrot.

The K.G.B. asked him why he was bothering them. Why didn't he just report it to the local police. He answered, "I just want you to know, I don't agree with a thing that parrot has to say."

In 4 months, we will mark the 5th anniversary of the March 23, 1983, speech in which I challenged the scientific community to develop a system that would make ballistic missiles obsolete. General George Patton once said, "Never tell people how to do things; tell them what to do, and they will surprise you with their ingenuity." That statement showed a deep insight into the American character, and it has been proven again in our drive to develop a strategic defense system.

Today, I have been deeply impressed with what I've seen and heard. The progress made toward achieving our goals has been nothing less than astounding. The critics who claimed it couldn't be done have been proven wrong again -- just has been the case with almost every technological triumph in the past. The scientific research and engineering work you are doing, along with that of others like you in hundreds of locations throughout this great land, is a tribute to the genius of America. This is truly a national effort -- both government and private sector -- involving pre-eminent individuals in industry, education, and the scientific community. No President could be prouder or more grateful than I am for all you, and your fellow colleagues around the country, are doing. God bless you.

(Rohrabacher/ARD)
November 20, 1987
8:00 p.m.

PRESIDENTIAL ADDRESS: SDI/INF
MARTIN-MARIETTA PLANT
DENVER, COLORADO
TUESDAY, NOVEMBER 24, 1987

Thank you. It is an honor for me to be with all of you, men and women of science and engineering, who play such a vital role in this age of technology. I will have to admit I'm a bit awed by what I've seen and heard today.

Of course, not all my predecessors shared my sense of wonder about such things. One, President Rutherford B. Hayes played host to a notable science and technology event back in 1876 -- a demonstration in the White House of the newly invented telephone. President Hayes' reaction: "That's an amazing invention," he said, "but who would ever want to use them?" (PAUSE) When I heard him say that, I thought he might be mistaken.

Seriously though, I was born in a small town in the farm country of Illinois. Progress in those days meant indoor plumbing, electric lights, a telephone, and perhaps a radio crystal set. Just in my lifetime, we've gone from a time when many, if not most, people traveled by horse power -- and I mean the kind that eats hay -- to an era of supersonic passenger service. And just possibly before I leave the scene, we will have developed a craft that will take off from runways as planes do today, but once at high altitude, this craft will rocket itself into space and zip to its destination at four or five times the speed of sound -- from New York to Tokyo in 90 minutes. (PAUSE) This could bring a whole new meaning for "sushi to go."

The America I was born into was acclaimed for its liberty and opportunity, yet that opportunity for which we were so proud has been expanded today beyond anything the Americans of my youth could possibly have imagined. Affordable world-wide communications and transportation have not just extended, but eliminated horizons. Computer capability, which a short time ago was available only to large corporations, is now being put to use by small business and individual entrepreneurs.

We are in an age when the common man can do and experience what in past times was enjoyed only by kings, royalty, and the elite. Jefferson, Washington, and Madison laid the foundation for liberty and equality; Edison, Einstein, Goddard, and others like them, like many of you, built on that foundation. It has been technology and freedom, together, that have pushed America ever forward and made her the land of abundance and progress we love so dearly.

British statesman Arthur Balfour once noted, "Science is the greatest instrument of social change... the most vital of all revolutions which marked the development of modern civilizations."

Science and technological-based revolutions in health care, food production, communications, transportation, manufacturing, and other endeavors have changed how we live and the quality of our lives. After what I have seen today, I believe that mankind is again on the edge of a revolution that will change the basic assumptions upon which we base our decisions and reshape the world in which we live.

Until now, mankind's search for security focused on expanding the ability to lash out, to kill, to destroy. Technological advances throughout the ages increased man's destructive power, and those nations that did not keep pace soon felt the sting of defeat and the pain of subjugation. This has been a fact of life. What you are doing here is changing the facts of life, and once you've completed your work, the world will never be the same. I suggest it will be a better and a safer world. And what better legacy can this generation leave than a safer world?

Our Strategic Defense Initiative offers mankind security through protection rather than retaliation. It is a scientific advance that will be judged a success based not on how many lives it is capable of taking, but on how many it is able to save. It is a moral as well as scientific endeavor worth every minute and hour you are dedicating to it.

I realize that being a government project, with all the politics that goes with that reality, your work can be frustrating. Wernher von Braun once said, "We can lick gravity, but sometimes the paperwork is overwhelming."

I appreciate the extraordinary effort each of you is making. Your mental prowess and creativity, and, yes, your hard work, will make or break the program. And I want you to know, what you accomplish will be put to good use in protecting your country, the free world, and perhaps all mankind against the threat of nuclear holocaust. You are not working to build a bargaining chip. It will not be traded away.

Yes, there are those who complain about the cost. Benjamin Franklin, himself a man of science and politics, once observed, "The expenses required to prevent a war are much lighter than those that will, if not prevented, be absolutely necessary to maintain it."

Well, mirroring that thought, I'd say that what we spend to protect ourselves from nuclear missiles is much lighter than the cost, human and otherwise, if even one nuclear missile is fired, even if by mistake, and we have to suffer the consequences because there is no way to stop it. In the case of S.D.I., America cannot afford <u>not</u> to do everything necessary to develop this missile defense system and put it into operation.

The Soviet Union, even as they criticize our S.D.I. research effort, has been aggressively moving ahead on its own anti-ballistic missile defense. They are spending many billions of dollars, and have concentrated the energy and talent of their brightest scientific minds. More than 10,000 skilled scientists and engineers are working on military lasers alone -- with thousands more developing high-tech weapons that use particle beams and kinetic energy.

The Soviet government wages its propaganda campaign against our S.D.I. research, even while they work overtime to develop their own S.D.I.-like system. We must not be conned into reducing our commitment. Their military program, which includes everything from killer-satellites to the modernized anti-missile system that protects Moscow, dwarfs our S.D.I. program already. Those who would cut or eliminate funds for our effort would grant

a clear monopoly in this vital area to our adversary. Because the question is not, will strategic defenses be developed? The question is rather, will the Soviet Union be the only country to possess them? The choice is ours.

Furthermore, the Strategic Defense Initiative is not aimed at protecting us and our allies against the Soviet Union alone. Francis Bacon once wrote, "He that will not apply new remedies must expect new evils; for time is the greatest innovator." Well, in the decades ahead, who knows what governments will obtain ballistic missile technology? Who knows how rational or competent those governments will be. I spoke before a meeting of the American Council of Life Insurance last week and I called S.D.I. an insurance policy. And that's what it is.

S.D.I. is not a weapon of war, but an insurer, a protector, of the peace. It is totally within the limits as set by the A.B.M. treaty, and -- even though there is evidence that the Soviets are in violation of this treaty -- we intend to continue our compliance. I believe that the Strategic Defense Initiative not only offers unprecedented protection, a break from relying totally on bigger and more effective killing machines, but it also complements our efforts to achieve missile reduction agreements. With a defensive system in place, the possibility that one side has cheated, and has a few missiles in hiding, is far less threatening. S.D.I., then, makes further reductions more likely. A system that makes ballistic missiles less effective, makes those missiles more negotiable.

Now there are those who may be pessimistic about the chances of deep reductions in the nuclear arsenals, but let us not forget that in 1981, when I first proposed our zero option, it too was all but written off by many commentators. In the time that has followed, we persevered and stuck to our principles. We held firm against the advocates of a so-called nuclear freeze. We followed through on our modernization program and in close cooperation with our allies, installed the Cruise and Pershings in Europe. When at long last it was realized that we in the alliance had the courage to protect our own long-run interests, progress toward a mutually beneficial treaty ensued.

As you are all aware, General Secretary Gorbachev will be visiting Washington beginning December 7th. If the last-minute details can be worked out, we hope to sign an historic treaty that will eliminate a whole class of U.S. and Soviet nuclear-armed intermediate-range missiles from the face of the Earth, the first mutually agreed upon reduction in our nuclear arsenals ever.

As I say, this will be a history-making event, yet it is only a first step, a model for others that will follow. We would hope to see progress on a number of fronts. The United States, for example, has proposed a 50-percent reduction in the number of U.S.-Soviet Offensive Strategic Forces. We are also looking for an agreement on chemical and biological weapons, and a reduction on both sides of the conventional military forces facing each other on the European continent. But let there be no doubt,

giving up the Strategic Defense Initiative and the protection it will provide is too high a price for any agreement.

Neither the I.N.F. treaty we hope to sign during the upcoming summit, nor any other agreement that follows, will be built on trust. Agreements with the Soviet Union must be based on reciprocity, verification, and realism. And while we want to bolster the peace and improve relations, no agreement should ever be signed simply for the sake of signing an agreement, for the sake of atmospherics. Improving the general tone of relations between our countries, as I've outlined on several occasions, will require much more movement toward the solution of regional conflicts, a far greater respect for human rights within the Soviet Union, and progress on a number of bilateral issues between our countries. As I've explained to General Secretary Gorbachev, our countries do not have differences because we are well-armed, we are well-armed because we have differences.

Even with all the talk of openness and Glasnost, much change needs to take place before trust, like that we have with democratic governments, can come into play. The Soviet peoples themselves -- even though there has been some change -- still tell stories and joke about their plight. I heard one about a fellow who went to the K.G.B. to report that he lost his parrot. The K.G.B. asked him why he was bothering them. Why didn't he just report it to the local police. He answered, "I just want you to know, I don't agree with a thing that parrot has to say."

In 4 months, we will mark the 5th anniversary of the March 23, 1983, speech in which I challenged the scientific

community to develop a system that would make ballistic missiles obsolete. General George Patton once said, "Never tell people how to do things; tell them what to do, and they will surprise you with their ingenuity." That statement showed a deep insight into the American character, and it has been proven again in our drive to develop a nuclear defense system.

Today, I have been deeply impressed with what I've seen and heard. The progress made toward achieving our goals has been nothing less than astounding. The critics who claimed it couldn't be done have been proven wrong again -- just has been the case with almost every technological triumph in the past. The scientific research and engineering work you are doing, along with that of others like you in hundreds of locations throughout this great land, is a tribute to the genius of America. This is truly a national effort -- both government and private sector -- involving pre-eminent individuals in industry, education, and the scientific community. No President could be prouder or more grateful than I am for all you, and your fellow colleagues around the country, are doing. God bless you.

(Rohrabacher/ARD)
November 20, 1987
7:00 p.m.

PRESIDENTIAL ADDRESS: SDI/INF
MARTIN-MARIETTA PLANT
DENVER, COLORADO
TUESDAY, NOVEMBER 24, 1987

Thank you. It is an honor for me to be with all of you, men and women of science and engineering, who play such a vital role in this age of technology. I will have to admit I'm a bit awed by what I've seen and heard today.

Of course, not all my predecessors shared my sense of wonder about such things. One, President Rutherford B. Hayes played host to a notable science and technology event back in 1876 -- a demonstration in the White House of the newly invented telephone. President Hayes' reaction: "That's an amazing invention," he said, "but who would ever want to use them?" (PAUSE) When I heard him say that, I thought he might be mistaken.

Seriously though, I was born in a small town in the farm country of Illinois. Progress in those days meant indoor plumbing, electric lights, a telephone, and perhaps a radio crystal set. Just in my lifetime, we've gone from a time when many, if not most, people traveled by horse power -- and I mean the kind that eats hay -- to an era of supersonic passenger service. And just possibly before I leave the scene, we will have developed a craft that will take off from runways as planes do today, but once at high altitude, this craft will rocket itself into space and zip to its destination at four or five times the speed of sound -- from New York to Tokyo in 90 minutes. (PAUSE) This could bring a whole new meaning for "sushi to go."

The America I was born into was acclaimed for its liberty and opportunity, yet that opportunity for which we were so proud has been expanded today beyond anything the Americans of my youth could possibly have imagined. Affordable world-wide communications and transportation have not just extended, but eliminated horizons. Computer capability, which a short time ago was available only to large corporations, is now being put to use by small business and individual entrepreneurs.

We are in an age when the common man can do and experience what in past times was enjoyed only by kings, royalty, and the elite. Jefferson, Washington, and Madison laid the foundation for liberty and equality; Edison, Einstein, Goddard, and others like them, like many of you, built on that foundation. It has been technology and freedom, together, that have pushed America ever forward and made her the land of abundance and progress we love so dearly.

British statesman Arthur Balfour once noted, "Science is the greatest instrument of social change... the most vital of all revolutions which marked the development of modern civilizations."

Science and technological-based revolutions in health care, food production, communications, transportation, manufacturing, and other endeavors have changed how we live and the quality of our lives. After what I have seen today, I believe that mankind is again on the edge of a revolution that will change the basic assumptions upon which we base our decisions and reshape the world in which we live.

Until now, mankind's search for security focused on expanding the ability to lash out, to kill, to destroy. Technological advances throughout the ages increased man's destructive power, and those nations that did not keep pace soon felt the sting of defeat and the pain of subjugation. This has been a fact of life. What you are doing here is changing the facts of life, and once you've completed your work, the world will never be the same. I suggest it will be a better and a safer world. And what better legacy can this generation leave than a safer world?

Our Strategic Defense Initiative offers mankind security through protection rather than retaliation. It is a scientific advance that will be judged a success based not on how many lives it is capable of taking, but on how many it is able to save. It is a moral as well as scientific endeavor worth every minute and hour you are dedicating to it.

I realize that being a government project, with all the politics that goes with that reality, your work can be frustrating. Wernher von Braun once said, "We can lick gravity, but sometimes the paperwork is overwhelming."

I appreciate the extraordinary effort each of you is ~~putting into this project~~. Your mental prowess and creativity, and, yes, your hard work, will make or break the program. And I want you to know, what you accomplish will be put to good use in protecting your country, the free world, and perhaps all mankind against the threat of nuclear holocaust. You are not working to build a bargaining chip. It will not be traded away.

Yes, there are those who complain about the cost. Benjamin Franklin, himself a man of science and politics, once observed, "The expenses required to prevent a war are much lighter than those that will, if not prevented, be absolutely necessary to maintain it."

Well, mirroring that thought, I'd say that what we spend to protect ourselves from nuclear missiles is much lighter than the cost, human and otherwise, if even one nuclear missile is fired, even if by mistake, and we have to suffer the consequences because there is no way to stop it. In the case of S.D.I., America cannot afford <u>not</u> to do everything necessary to develop this missile defense system and put it into operation.

The Soviet Union, even as they criticize our S.D.I. research effort, has been aggressively moving ahead on its own anti-ballistic missile defense. They are spending many billions of dollars, and have concentrated the energy and talent of their brightest scientific minds. More than 10,000 skilled scientists amd engineers are working on military lasers alone -- with thousands more developing high-tech weapons that use particle beams and kinetic energy.

The Soviet government wages its propaganda campaign against our S.D.I. research, even while they work overtime to develop their own S.D.I.-like system. We must not be conned into reducing our commitment. Their military program, which includes everything from killer-satellites to the modernized anti-missile system that protects Moscow, dwarfs our S.D.I. program already. Those who would cut or eliminate funds for our effort would grant

a clear monopoly in this vital area to ~~the Soviet Union~~ our adversary. Because the question is not, will strategic defenses be developed? The question is rather, will the Soviet Union be the only country to possess them? The choice is ours.

Furthermore, the Strategic Defense Initiative is not aimed at protecting us and our allies against the Soviet Union alone. Francis Bacon once wrote, "He that will not apply new remedies must expect new evils; for time is the greatest innovator." Well, in the decades ahead, who knows what governments will obtain ballistic missiles technology? Who knows how rational or competent those governments will be. I spoke before a meeting of the American Council of Life Insurance last week and I called S.D.I. an insurance policy. And that's what it is.

S.D.I. is not a weapon of war, but an insurer, a protector, of the peace. It is totally within the limits as set by the A.B.M. treaty, and ~~we intend~~ even though there is evidence that the Soviets are in violation of this treaty we intend to continue our compliance. I believe that the Strategic Defense Initiative not only offers unprecedented protection, a break from relying on bigger and more of the same, but it also complements our efforts to achieve missile reduction agreements. With a defensive system in place, the possibility that one side has cheated, and has a few missiles in hiding, is far less threatening. S.D.I., then, makes further reductions more likely. A system that makes ballistic missiles less effective, makes those missiles more negotiable.

Now there are those who may be pessimistic about the chances of deep reductions in the nuclear arsenals, but let us not forget that in 1981, when I first proposed our zero option, it too was

all but written off by many commentator. In the time that has followed, we persevered and stuck to our principles. We held firm against the advocates of a so-called nuclear freeze. We followed through on our modernization program and in close cooperation with our allies, installed the Cruise and Pershings in Europe. When at long last it was realized that we ~~and~~ in the alliance had the courage to protect our own long-run interests, progress toward a mutually beneficial treaty ensued.

As you are all aware, General Secretary Gorbachev will be visiting Washington beginning December 7th. If the last-minute details can be worked out, we hope to sign an historic treaty that will eliminate a whole class of U.S. and Soviet nuclear-armed intermediate-range missiles from the face of the Earth, the first mutually agreed upon reduction in our nuclear arsenals ever.

As I say, this will be a history-making event, yet it is only a first step, a model for others that will follow. We would hope to see progress on a number of fronts. The United States, for example, has proposed a 50-percent reduction in the number of U.S.-Soviet Offensive Strategic Forces. We are also looking for an agreement on chemical and biological weapons, and a reduction on both sides of the conventional military forces facing each other on the European continent. But let there be no doubt, giving up the Strategic Defense Initiative and the protection it will provide is too high a price for any agreement.

Neither the I.N.F. treaty we hope to ~~be signed~~ during the upcoming summit, nor any other agreement that follows, will be

built on trust. Agreements with the Soviet Union must be based on reciprocity, verification, and realism. And while we want to bolster the peace and improve relations, no agreement should ever be signed simply for the sake of signing an agreement, for the sake of atmospherics. Improving the general tone of relations between our countries, as I've outlined on several occasions, will require much more movement toward the solutions of regional conflicts, a far greater respect for human rights within the Soviet Union, and progress on a number of bilateral issues between our countries. As I've explained to General Secretary Gorbachev, our countries do not have differences because we are well-armed, we are well-armed because we have differences.

Even with all the talk of openness and Glasnost, much change needs to take place before trust, like that we have with democratic governments, can come into play. The Soviet peoples themselves -- even though there has been some change -- still tell stories and joke about their plight. I heard one about a fellow who went to the K.G.B. to report that he lost his parrot. The K.G.B. asked him why he was bothering them. Why didn't he just report it to the local police. He answered, "I just want you to know, I don't agree with a thing that parrot has to say."

In 4 months, we will mark the 5th anniversary of the March 23, 1983, speech in which I challenged the scientific community to develop a system that would make ballistic missiles obsolete. General George Patton once said, "Never tell people how to do things; tell them what to do, and they will surprise you with their ingenuity." That statement showed a deep insight

into the American character, and it has been proven again in our drive to develop a nuclear defense system.

Today, I have been deeply impressed with what I've seen and heard. The progress made toward achieving our goals has been nothing less than astounding. The critics who claimed it couldn't be done have been proven wrong again -- just has been the case with almost every technological triumph in the past. The scientific research and engineering work you are doing, along with that of others like you in hundreds of locations throughout this great land, is a tribute to the genius of America. This is truly a national effort -- both government and private sector -- involving pre-eminent individuals in industry, education, and the scientific community. No President could be prouder or more grateful than I am for all you, and your fellow colleagues around the country, are doing. God bless you.

Meeting the Strategic Threat:
National Security and Arms Reductions

-- The Reagan Administration has had a well defined strategy for countering the threat posed by the Soviet offensive nuclear buildup. Our goal is to build a safer peace and to ensure a stable strategic balance over the long term.

-- This strategy has three key elements:

- Modernizing our strategic deterrent because, to keep the peace, we still rely on the threat of retaliation with offensive nuclear weapons;

- Pursuing deep, equitable and effectively verifiable reductions in US and Soviet nuclear arms; and

- Seeking through the U.S. Strategic Defense Initiative (SDI) a safer and morally preferable means to deter war, by increasing reliance on defenses to enhance US and Allied security.

-- Arms reductions negotiations are not an end in themselves, but rather a key element of President Reagan's strategy to ensure our national security. Through arms reductions, we seek to enhance strategic stability at lower levels of military forces, thus reducing the risk of conflict. Such reductions would establish a foundation of mutual restraint and responsibility that would help us build a safer world.

-- Recognizing the potential contribution of arms reductions to building a safer peace, the Administration has engaged the Soviets (and, with our Allies, other Warsaw Pact states) on a wide range of issues, including: nuclear arms, conventional forces, chemical weapons, military confidence-building measures, nuclear non-proliferation, and nuclear risk reduction centers.

-- It is precisely because the Administration has held steadfastly to all three parts of our response to the Soviet strategic threat that we have been able to set the arms reduction agenda. We have convinced the Soviets to start negotiating seriously and to accept in principle our call for deep nuclear arms reductions and effective verification:

- Strategic Arms Reductions (START): At the 1985 Geneva Summit, Gorbachev agreed with the President to pursue 50% reductions in strategic arms. In Reykjavik last year, the two leaders reached major new areas of agreement on a general framework for strategic reductions. And during the Soviet Foreign Minister's visit to Washington in September, we agreed to accelerate the pace in START.

- Intermediate-range Nuclear Forces (INF): The Soviets have accepted the President's zero option proposal in INF--eliminating an entire class of U.S. and Soviet

missiles. We have now agreed in principle to conclude an agreement. Negotiators are hard at work to resolve remaining issues; we hope a treaty will be signed at a summit this fall.

- Verification: The United States will not accept any arms control agreement which is not effectively verifiable. The Soviets know that we are prepared to have no agreement rather than one which is not verifiable. As a result, the Soviets appear ready to accept many of the verification requirements which we have put forth. In INF, for example, they have accepted in principle our verification regime, the most stringent in the history of arms control. Important details remain to be worked out, however.

- Nuclear Risk Reduction Centers (NRRCs): In September we and the Soviets signed an agreement to establish NRRCs in our respective capitals to reduce the risk of conflict between us resulting from accident, miscalculation or misinterpretation.

- Inspection of military activities: In August the U.S. conducted--under the Conference on Disarmament in Europe (CDE) Stockholm Document which was signed last September--the first ever inspection-on-demand of a Soviet military exercise. This process is designed to increase openness and build confidence.

-- The Importance of SDI: That the Soviets have moved so far toward our arms reduction goals is attributable, at least in part, to U.S. determination to press forward with SDI. SDI serves a number of vital purposes:

- Through SDI we seek a safer and more stable means of deterring aggression, based on defenses protecting the U.S. and our Allies against ballistic missile attack.

- SDI is a prudent hedge against the Soviets' own heavy involvement in strategic defense. Leaving them with a monopoly in defenses would threaten the peace by undermining the credibility of our offense-based deterrent.

- Along with NATO counter-deployments in INF, it was SDI that brought the Soviets back to the nuclear arms negotiating table in January 1985, after their December 1983 walkout.

- SDI is not a bargaining chip, but provides a strong incentive to the Soviets to agree to deep reductions in strategic arms.

- In the Defense and Space part of the Geneva Nuclear and Space Talks (NST), we seek Soviet agreement to a jointly managed transition to a deterrent regime based on effective strategic defenses, should such defenses prove feasible.

- Even if 50% cuts in START are achieved, SDI will continue to be essential in persuading the Soviets to consider further reductions.

- SDI is not only a search for defensive deterrence, but also underwrites the integrity of new arms agreements by diminishing Soviet incentive to cheat. The record of Soviet noncompliance with past arms control agreements makes this especially important.

- Finally, SDI is insurance against an accidental missile launch or possible future ballistic missile threats--nuclear, conventional or chemical--from outlaw countries.

-- The way ahead: Our priorities in arms talks over the next few years.

- Complete an agreement in INF, an historic achievement eliminating an entire class of US and Soviet nuclear arms.

- Press hard for agreement in START. The Soviets must respond to the need for sublimits on the most dangerous systems--fast-flying ballistic missiles--and drop their insistence on linking strategic reductions to their efforts to cripple the US SDI program.

- Following the priorities established by NATO Foreign Ministers in their meeting in Reykjavik in June, we need to take steps at the same time to redress the serious imbalances in conventional and chemical arms which favor the Warsaw Pact. We are doing this by: seeking US and NATO force improvements; pursuing the East/West MBFR negotiations in Vienna; seeking Warsaw Pact agreement on a mandate for new conventional stability negotiations; and, pursuing an effective global ban on chemical weapons.

-- The Bottom Line:

- These broad efforts have followed the strategy on national security and arms reductions laid out in 1981-82.

- We established clear objectives and held to them.

- We are close now to an historic agreement in INF, the first real reduction of nuclear arms.

- By modernizing our strategic deterrent, keeping our strong commitment to SDI, and strengthening NATO's posture of deterrence and defense, we provide the basis for significant progress in other areas as well.

- The Soviet leadership must now translate into concrete actions its professed desire to improve our relationship and to reach stabilizing arms reduction agreements.

Appointment of James W. Winchester as a United States Commissioner of the International Pacific Halibut Commission
March 23, 1983

The President today announced his intention to appoint James W. Winchester to be a United States Commissioner to the International Pacific Halibut Commission for a term of 2 years. This is a new position.

Mr. Winchester is Associate Administrator of the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, Department of Commerce. Previously he was a consultant and owner of Business & Engineering Consultants, Inc.; Director, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration Data Buoy Office, St. Louis, Mo., in 1972–1977; vice president and general manager of Oceanographic Services, Inc., Santa Barbara, Calif., in 1966–1972; head of field projects for the Office of Naval Reseach in 1956–1966; and research associate, Johns Hopkins University, in 1955–1956.

He graduated from Furman University (B.S.), Johns Hopkins University (M.A.), and the American University (M.A.). He is married, has three children, and resides in Arlington, Va. He was born November 7, 1916, in Central, S.C.

Address to the Nation on Defense and National Security
March 23, 1983

My fellow Americans, thank you for sharing your time with me tonight.

The subject I want to discuss with you, peace and national security, is both timely and important. Timely, because I've reached a decision which offers a new hope for our children in the 21st century, a decision I'll tell you about in a few minutes. And important because there's a very big decision that you must make for yourselves. This subject involves the most basic duty that any President and any people share, the duty to protect and strengthen the peace.

At the beginning of this year, I submitted to the Congress a defense budget which reflects my best judgment of the best understanding of the experts and specialists who advise me about what we and our allies must do to protect our people in the years ahead. That budget is much more than a long list of numbers, for behind all the numbers lies America's ability to prevent the greatest of human tragedies and preserve our free way of life in a sometimes dangerous world. It is part of a careful, long-term plan to make America strong again after too many years of neglect and mistakes.

Our efforts to rebuild America's defenses and strengthen the peace began 2 years ago when we requested a major increase in the defense program. Since then, the amount of those increases we first proposed has been reduced by half, through improvements in management and procurement and other savings.

The budget request that is now before the Congress has been trimmed to the limits of safety. Further deep cuts cannot be made without seriously endangering the security of the Nation. The choice is up to the men and women you've elected to the Congress, and that means the choice is up to you.

Tonight, I want to explain to you what this defense debate is all about and why I'm convinced that the budget now before the Congress is necessary, responsible, and deserving of your support. And I want to offer hope for the future.

But first, let me say what the defense debate is not about. It is not about spending arithmetic. I know that in the last few weeks you've been bombarded with numbers and percentages. Some say we need

430-511 O - 84 - 29 : QL 3

only a 5-percent increase in defense spending. The so-called alternate budget backed by liberals in the House of Representatives would lower the figure to 2 to 3 percent, cutting our defense spending by $163 billion over the next 5 years. The trouble with all these numbers is that they tell us little about the kind of defense program America needs or the benefits and security and freedom that our defense effort buys for us.

What seems to have been lost in all this debate is the simple truth of how a defense budget is arrived at. It isn't done by deciding to spend a certain number of dollars. Those loud voices that are occasionally heard charging that the Government is trying to solve a security problem by throwing money at it are nothing more than noise based on ignorance. We start by considering what must be done to maintain peace and review all the possible threats against our security. Then a strategy for strengthening peace and defending against those threats must be agreed upon. And, finally, our defense establishment must be evaluated to see what is necessary to protect against any or all of the potential threats. The cost of achieving these ends is totaled up, and the result is the budget for national defense.

There is no logical way that you can say, let's spend x billion dollars less. You can only say, which part of our defense measures do we believe we can do without and still have security against all contingencies? Anyone in the Congress who advocates a percentage or a specific dollar cut in defense spending should be made to say what part of our defenses he would eliminate, and he should be candid enough to acknowledge that his cuts mean cutting our commitments to allies or inviting greater risk or both.

The defense policy of the United States is based on a simple premise: The United States does not start fights. We will never be an aggressor. We maintain our strength in order to deter and defend against aggression—to preserve freedom and peace.

Since the dawn of the atomic age, we've sought to reduce the risk of war by maintaining a strong deterrent and by seeking genuine arms control. "Deterrence" means simply this: making sure any adversary who thinks about attacking the United States, or our allies, or our vital interests, concludes that the risks to him outweigh any potential gains. Once he understands that, he won't attack. We maintain the peace through our strength; weakness only invites aggression.

This strategy of deterrence has not changed. It still works. But what it takes to maintain deterrence has changed. It took one kind of military force to deter an attack when we had far more nuclear weapons than any other power; it takes another kind now that the Soviets, for example, have enough accurate and powerful nuclear weapons to destroy virtually all of our missiles on the ground. Now, this is not to say that the Soviet Union is planning to make war on us. Nor do I believe a war is inevitable—quite the contrary. But what must be recognized is that our security is based on being prepared to meet all threats.

There was a time when we depended on coastal forts and artillery batteries, because, with the weaponry of that day, any attack would have had to come by sea. Well, this is a different world, and our defenses must be based on recognition and awareness of the weaponry possessed by other nations in the nuclear age.

We can't afford to believe that we will never be threatened. There have been two world wars in my lifetime. We didn't start them and, indeed, did everything we could to avoid being drawn into them. But we were ill-prepared for both. Had we been better prepared, peace might have been preserved.

For 20 years the Soviet Union has been accumulating enormous military might. They didn't stop when their forces exceeded all requirements of a legitimate defensive capability. And they haven't stopped now. During the past decade and a half, the Soviets have built up a massive arsenal of new strategic nuclear weapons—weapons that can strike directly at the United States.

As an example, the United States introduced its last new intercontinental ballistic missile, the Minute Man III, in 1969, and we're now dismantling our even older Titan missiles. But what has the Soviet Union done in these intervening years? Well, since 1969 the Soviet Union has built five new

classes of ICBM's, and upgraded these eight times. As a result, their missiles are much more powerful and accurate than they were several years ago, and they continue to develop more, while ours are increasingly obsolete.

The same thing has happened in other areas. Over the same period, the Soviet Union built 4 new classes of submarine-launched ballistic missiles and over 60 new missile submarines. We built 2 new types of submarine missiles and actually withdrew 10 submarines from strategic missions. The Soviet Union built over 200 new Backfire bombers, and their brand new Blackjack bomber is now under development. We haven't built a new long-range bomber since our B–52's were deployed about a quarter of a century ago, and we've already retired several hundred of those because of old age. Indeed, despite what many people think, our strategic forces only cost about 15 percent of the defense budget.

Another example of what's happened: In 1978 the Soviets had 600 intermediate-range nuclear missiles based on land and were beginning to add the SS–20—a new, highly accurate, mobile missile with 3 warheads. We had none. Since then the Soviets have strengthened their lead. By the end of 1979, when Soviet leader Brezhnev declared "a balance now exists," the Soviets had over 800 warheads. We still had none. A year ago this month, Mr. Brezhnev pledged a moratorium, or freeze, on SS–20 deployment. But by last August, their 800 warheads had become more than 1,200. We still had none. Some freeze. At this time Soviet Defense Minister Ustinov announced "approximate parity of forces continues to exist." But the Soviets are still adding an average of 3 new warheads a week, and now have 1,300. These warheads can reach their targets in a matter of a few minutes. We still have none. So far, it seems that the Soviet definition of parity is a box score of 1,300 to nothing, in their favor.

So, together with our NATO allies, we decided in 1979 to deploy new weapons, beginning this year, as a deterrent to their SS–20's and as an incentive to the Soviet Union to meet us in serious arms control negotiations. We will begin that deployment late this year. At the same time, however, we're willing to cancel our program if the Soviets will dismantle theirs. This is what we've called a zero-zero plan. The Soviets are now at the negotiating table—and I think it's fair to say that without our planned deployments, they wouldn't be there.

Now, let's consider conventional forces. Since 1974 the United States has produced 3,050 tactical combat aircraft. By contrast, the Soviet Union has produced twice as many. When we look at attack submarines, the United States has produced 27 while the Soviet Union has produced 61. For armored vehicles, including tanks, we have produced 11,200. The Soviet Union has produced 54,000—nearly 5 to 1 in their favor. Finally, with artillery, we've produced 950 artillery and rocket launchers while the Soviets have produced more than 13,000—a staggering 14-to-1 ratio.

There was a time when we were able to offset superior Soviet numbers with higher quality, but today they are building weapons as sophisticated and modern as our own.

As the Soviets have increased their military power, they've been emboldened to extend that power. They're spreading their military influence in ways that can directly challenge our vital interests and those of our allies.

The following aerial photographs, most of them secret until now, illustrate this point in a crucial area very close to home: Central America and the Caribbean Basin. They're not dramatic photographs. But I think they help give you a better understanding of what I'm talking about.

This Soviet intelligence collection facility, less than a hundred miles from our coast, is the largest of its kind in the world. The acres and acres of antennae fields and intelligence monitors are targeted on key U.S. military installations and sensitive activities. The installation in Lourdes, Cuba, is manned by 1,500 Soviet technicians. And the satellite ground station allows instant communications with Moscow. This 28-square-mile facility has grown by more than 60 percent in size and capability during the past decade.

In western Cuba, we see this military air-

field and it complement of modern, Soviet-built Mig-23 aircraft. The Soviet Union uses this Cuban airfield for its own long-range reconnaissance missions. And earlier this month, two modern Soviet antisubmarine warfare aircraft began operating from it. During the past 2 years, the level of Soviet arms exports to Cuba can only be compared to the levels reached during the Cuban missile crisis 20 years ago.

This third photo, which is the only one in this series that has been previously made public, shows Soviet military hardware that has made its way to Central America. This airfield with its MI–8 helicopters, anti-aircraft guns, and protected fighter sites is one of a number of military facilities in Nicaragua which has received Soviet equipment funneled through Cuba, and reflects the massive military buildup going on in that country.

On the small island of Grenada, at the southern end of the Caribbean chain, the Cubans, with Soviet financing and backing, are in the process of building an airfield with a 10,000-foot runway. Grenada doesn't even have an air force. Who is it intended for? The Caribbean is a very important passageway for our international commerce and military lines of communication. More than half of all American oil imports now pass through the Caribbean. The rapid buildup of Grenada's military potential is unrelated to any conceivable threat to this island country of under 110,000 people and totally at odds with the pattern of other eastern Caribbean States, most of which are unarmed.

The Soviet-Cuban militarization of Grenada, in short, can only be seen as power projection into the region. And it is in this important economic and strategic area that we're trying to help the Governments of El Salvador, Costa Rica, Honduras, and others in their struggles for democracy against guerrillas supported through Cuba and Nicaragua.

These pictures only tell a small part of the story. I wish I could show you more without compromising our most sensitive intelligence sources and methods. But the Soviet Union is also supporting Cuban military forces in Angola and Ethiopia. They have bases in Ethiopia and South Yemen, near the Persian Gulf oil fields. They've taken over the port that we built at Cam Ranh Bay in Vietnam. And now for the first time in history, the Soviet Navy is a force to be reckoned with in the South Pacific.

Some people may still ask: Would the Soviets ever use their formidable military power? Well, again, can we afford to believe they won't? There is Afghanistan. And in Poland, the Soviets denied the will of the people and in so doing demonstrated to the world how their military power could also be used to intimidate.

The final fact is that the Soviet Union is acquiring what can only be considered an offensive military force. They have continued to build far more intercontinental ballistic missiles than they could possibly need simply to deter an attack. Their conventional forces are trained and equipped not so much to defend against an attack as they are to permit sudden, surprise offensives of their own.

Our NATO allies have assumed a great defense burden, including the military draft in most countries. We're working with them and our other friends around the world to do more. Our defensive strategy means we need military forces that can move very quickly, forces that are trained and ready to respond to any emergency.

Every item in our defense program—our ships, our tanks, our planes, our funds for training and spare parts—is intended for one all-important purpose: to keep the peace. Unfortunately, a decade of neglecting our military forces had called into question our ability to do that.

When I took office in January 1981, I was appalled by what I found: American planes that couldn't fly and American ships that couldn't sail for lack of spare parts and trained personnel and insufficient fuel and ammunition for essential training. The inevitable result of all this was poor morale in our Armed Forces, difficulty in recruiting the brightest young Americans to wear the uniform, and difficulty in convincing our most experienced military personnel to stay on.

There was a real question then about how well we could meet a crisis. And it was obvious that we had to begin a major mod-

ernization program to ensure we could deter aggression and preserve the peace in the years ahead.

We had to move immediately to improve the basic readiness and staying power of our conventional forces, so they could meet—and therefore help deter—a crisis. We had to make up for lost years of investment by moving forward with a long-term plan to prepare our forces to counter the military capabilities our adversaries were developing for the future.

I know that all of you want peace, and so do I. I know too that many of you seriously believe that a nuclear freeze would further the cause of peace. But a freeze now would make us less, not more, secure and would raise, not reduce, the risks of war. It would be largely unverifiable and would seriously undercut our negotiations on arms reduction. It would reward the Soviets for their massive military buildup while preventing us from modernizing our aging and increasingly vulnerable forces. With their present margin of superiority, why should they agree to arms reductions knowing that we were prohibited from catching up?

Believe me, it wasn't pleasant for someone who had come to Washington determined to reduce government spending, but we had to move forward with the task of repairing our defenses or we would lose our ability to deter conflict now and in the future. We had to demonstrate to any adversary that aggression could not succeed, and that the only real solution was substantial, equitable, and effectively verifiable arms reduction—the kind we're working for right now in Geneva.

Thanks to your strong support, and bipartisan support from the Congress, we began to turn things around. Already, we're seeing some very encouraging results. Quality recruitment and retention are up dramatically—more high school graduates are choosing military careers, and more experienced career personnel are choosing to stay. Our men and women in uniform at last are getting the tools and training they need to do their jobs.

Ask around today, especially among our young people, and I think you will find a whole new attitude toward serving their country. This reflects more than just better pay, equipment, and leadership. You the American people have sent a signal to these young people that it is once again an honor to wear the uniform. That's not something you measure in a budget, but it's a very real part of our nation's strength.

It'll take us longer to build the kind of equipment we need to keep peace in the future, but we've made a good start.

We haven't built a new long-range bomber for 21 years. Now we're building the B–1. We hadn't launched one new strategic submarine for 17 years. Now we're building one Trident submarine a year. Our land-based missiles are increasingly threatened by the many huge, new Soviet ICBM's. We're determining how to solve that problem. At the same time, we're working in the START and INF negotiations with the goal of achieving deep reductions in the strategic and intermediate nuclear arsenals of both sides.

We have also begun the long-needed modernization of our conventional forces. The Army is getting its first new tank in 20 years. The Air Force is modernizing. We're rebuilding our Navy, which shrank from about a thousand ships in the late 1960's to 453 during the 1970's. Our nation needs a superior navy to support our military forces and vital interests overseas. We're now on the road to achieving a 600-ship navy and increasing the amphibious capabilities of our marines, who are now serving the cause of peace in Lebanon. And we're building a real capability to assist our friends in the vitally important Indian Ocean and Persian Gulf region.

This adds up to a major effort, and it isn't cheap. It comes at a time when there are many other pressures on our budget and when the American people have already had to make major sacrifices during the recession. But we must not be misled by those who would make defense once again the scapegoat of the Federal budget.

The fact is that in the past few decades we have seen a dramatic shift in how we spend the taxpayer's dollar. Back in 1955, payments to individuals took up only about 20 percent of the Federal budget. For nearly three decades, these payments steadily increased and, this year, will account for

49 percent of the budget. By contrast, in 1955 defense took up more than half of the Federal budget. By 1980 this spending had fallen to a low of 23 percent. Even with the increase that I am requesting this year, defense will still amount to only 28 percent of the budget.

The calls for cutting back the defense budget come in nice, simple arithmetic. They're the same kind of talk that led the democracies to neglect their defenses in the 1930's and invited the tragedy of World War II. We must not let that grim chapter of history repeat itself through apathy or neglect.

This is why I'm speaking to you tonight—to urge you to tell your Senators and Congressmen that you know we must continue to restore our military strength. If we stop in midstream, we will send a signal of decline, of lessened will, to friends and adversaries alike. Free people must voluntarily, through open debate and democratic means, meet the challenge that totalitarians pose by compulsion. It's up to us, in our time, to choose and choose wisely between the hard but necessary task of preserving peace and freedom and the temptation to ignore our duty and blindly hope for the best while the enemies of freedom grow stronger day by day.

The solution is well within our grasp. But to reach it, there is simply no alternative but to continue this year, in this budget, to provide the resources we need to preserve the peace and guarantee our freedom.

Now, thus far tonight I've shared with you my thoughts on the problems of national security we must face together. My predecessors in the Oval Office have appeared before you on other occasions to describe the threat posed by Soviet power and have proposed steps to address that threat. But since the advent of nuclear weapons, those steps have been increasingly directed toward deterrence of aggression through the promise of retaliation.

This approach to stability through offensive threat has worked. We and our allies have succeeded in preventing nuclear war for more than three decades. In recent months, however, my advisers, including in particular the Joint Chiefs of Staff, have underscored the necessity to break out of a future that relies solely on offensive retaliation for our security.

Over the course of these discussions, I've become more and more deeply convinced that the human spirit must be capable of rising above dealing with other nations and human beings by threatening their existence. Feeling this way, I believe we must thoroughly examine every opportunity for reducing tensions and for introducing greater stability into the strategic calculus on both sides.

One of the most important contributions we can make is, of course, to lower the level of all arms, and particularly nuclear arms. We're engaged right now in several negotiations with the Soviet Union to bring about a mutual reduction of weapons. I will report to you a week from tomorrow my thoughts on that score. But let me just say, I'm totally committed to this course.

If the Soviet Union will join with us in our effort to achieve major arms reduction, we will have succeeded in stabilizing the nuclear balance. Nevertheless, it will still be necessary to rely on the specter of retaliation, on mutual threat. And that's a sad commentary on the human condition. Wouldn't it be better to save lives than to avenge them? Are we not capable of demonstrating our peaceful intentions by applying all our abilities and our ingenuity to achieving a truly lasting stability? I think we are. Indeed, we must.

After careful consultation with my advisers, including the Joint Chiefs of Staff, I believe there is a way. Let me share with you a vision of the future which offers hope. It is that we embark on a program to counter the awesome Soviet missile threat with measures that are defensive. Let us turn to the very strengths in technology that spawned our great industrial base and that have given us the quality of life we enjoy today.

What if free people could live secure in the knowledge that their security did not rest upon the threat of instant U.S. retaliation to deter a Soviet attack, that we could intercept and destroy strategic ballistic missiles before they reached our own soil or that of our allies?

I know this is a formidable, technical task,

[redacted] that may not be accomplished before the end of this century. Yet, current technology has attained a level of sophistication where it's reasonable for us to begin this effort. It will take years, probably decades of effort on many fronts. There will be failures and setbacks, just as there will be successes and breakthroughs. And as we proceed, we must remain constant in preserving the nuclear deterrent and maintaining a solid capability for flexible response. But isn't it worth every investment necessary to free the world from the threat of nuclear war? We know it is.

In the meantime, we will continue to pursue real reductions in nuclear arms, negotiating from a position of strength that can be ensured only by modernizing our strategic forces. At the same time, we must take steps to reduce the risk of a conventional military conflict escalating to nuclear war by improving our nonnuclear capabilities.

America does possess—now—the technologies to attain very significant improvements in the effectiveness of our conventional, nonnuclear forces. Proceeding boldly with these new technologies, we can significantly reduce any incentive that the Soviet Union may have to threaten attack against the United States or its allies.

As we pursue our goal of defensive technologies, we recognize that our allies rely upon our strategic offensive power to deter attacks against them. Their vital interests and ours are inextricably linked. Their safety and ours are one. And no change in technology can or will alter that reality. We must and shall continue to honor our commitments.

I clearly recognize that defensive systems have limitations and raise certain problems and ambiguities. If paired with offensive systems, they can be viewed as fostering an aggressive policy, and no one wants that. But with these considerations firmly in mind, I call upon the scientific community in our country, those who gave us nuclear weapons, to turn their great talents now to the cause of mankind and world peace, to give us the means of rendering these nuclear weapons impotent and obsolete.

Tonight, consistent with our obligations of the ABM treaty and recognizing the need for closer consultation with our allies, I'm taking an important first step. I am directing a comprehensive and intensive effort to define a long-term research and development program to begin to achieve our ultimate goal of eliminating the threat posed by strategic nuclear missiles. This could pave the way for arms control measures to eliminate the weapons themselves. We seek neither military superiority nor political advantage. Our only purpose—one all people share—is to search for ways to reduce the danger of nuclear war.

My fellow Americans, tonight we're launching an effort which holds the promise of changing the course of human history. There will be risks, and results take time. But I believe we can do it. As we cross this threshold, I ask for your prayers and your support.

Thank you, good night, and God bless you.

Note: The President spoke at 8:02 p.m. from the Oval Office at the White House. The address was broadcast live on nationwide radio and television.

Following his remarks, the President met in the White House with a number of administration officials, including members of the Cabinet, the White House staff, and the Joint Chiefs of Staff, and former officials of past administrations, to discuss the address.

THE WHITE HOUSE

WASHINGTON

November 19, 1987

MEMORANDUM FOR HOWARD H. BAKER, JR.

THROUGH: THOMAS C. GRISCOM

FROM: JAMES L. HOOLEY

SUBJECT: PRESIDENTIAL TRIP TO DENVER, COLORADO
TUESDAY, NOVEMBER 24, 1987

Event Concept

En route to Santa Barbara, California, on Tuesday, November 24, 1987, the President will visit the Martin Marietta Denver Aeronautics Facility outside of Denver, Colorado to highlight his commitment to a strategic defense for America.

At the facility the President will receive a classified, closed briefing centering on Martin Marietta's Zenith Star project. Although only one component of the complete SDI program, Zenith Star is a principal element of our space based, directed energy defensive system.

The President will also take part in an expanded panel briefing, before approximately 2000 Martin Marietta employees. This panel will feature several noted, objective, scientific authorities whose remarks are intended to underscore the defensive nature of the program, the viability of SDI in general, and to counter reports that the program remains purely notional and unlikely to work. This panel presentation will be open to the press.

The President will respond to the panel briefing with an address endorsing the continued research of SDI, generally emphasizing that the program is workable, defensive and realistic. The President has the opportunity to convey SDI as providing strength and toughness in bargaining, and to stress its future-oriented, defensive nature.

It is necessary to note that an early decision as to a foul weather plan is highly recommended. In the event that helicopter travel is prohibited by weather, there would be unusually lengthy drive times. Since driving could potentially put the President in the car for up to 3 hours, I would recommend that the trip be automatically postponed if it is determined that we cannot fly. I will discuss this issue with Tom Griscom in more detail.

05/19/87 4:00 p.m.

Finally, we will have less helicopter seats in Colorado than on a normal trip. Although we will make every attempt to accommodate all passengers, we may need to request that some people remain on board Air Force One for the duration of the President's visit to Martin Marietta.

A similar memorandum will be forwarded to Rhett Dawson for submission to the President unless otherwise instructed.

cc:
K. Duberstein
W. Ball
F. Carlucci
R. Dawson
F. Donatelli
M. Fitzwater
N. Risque
D. Chew
J. Courtemanche
T. Dolan
C. Powell
R. Range
F. Ryan
J. Tuck
J. Kuhn
M. Weinberg

05/19/87 4:00 p.m.

THE WHITE HOUSE

WASHINGTON

PROPOSED DRAFT SUMMARY SCHEDULE OF THE PRESIDENT

TUESDAY, NOVEMBER 24, 1987

8:40 a.m. THE PRESIDENT proceeds to Marine One for boarding.

OPEN PRESS COVERAGE

8:45 a.m. MARINE ONE departs the South Lawn.

Flight Time: 10 mins.

8:55 a.m. MARINE ONE arrives Andrews Air Force Base.

OPEN PRESS COVERAGE
CLOSED ARRIVAL/DEPARTURE

THE PRESIDENT deplanes and proceeds to Air Force One for boarding.

9:00 a.m. EST AIR FORCE ONE departs Andrews Air Force Base en route Denver, Colorado.

Flight Time: 3 hrs. and 30 mins.
Time Change: - 2 hrs.
Food Service: Lunch

10:30 a.m. MST AIR FORCE ONE arrives Denver, Colorado.

OPEN PRESS COVERAGE

THE PRESIDENT deplanes and proceeds to Marine One for boarding.

10:35 a.m. MARINE ONE departs Denver, Colorado en route Waterton, Colorado.

Flight Time: 15 mins.

10:50 a.m. MARINE ONE arrives Martin Marietta Denver Aerospace landing zone, Waterton, Colorado.

OPEN PRESS COVERAGE

05/19/87 4:00 p.m.

THE PRESIDENT deplanes and proceeds to motorcade for boarding.

10:55 a.m. THE PRESIDENT departs landing zone en route Rapid Retargeting and Precision Pointing Laboratory.

11:00 a.m. THE PRESIDENT arrives Rapid Retargeting and Precision Pointing Laboratory and proceeds inside.

11:05 a.m. * Receive briefing on SDI development

11:25 a.m. * View demonstration of R2P2 device

OFFICIAL PHOTOGRAPHER ONLY

11:35 a.m. THE PRESIDENT concludes briefing and proceeds to motorcade for boarding.

11:40 a.m. THE PRESIDENT departs Rapid Retargeting and Precision Pointing Laboratory en route Building M-3.

11:45 a.m. THE PRESIDENT arrives Building M-3 and proceeds to holding room.

THE PRESIDENT arrives holding room.

THE PRESIDENT proceeds to off-stage announcement area.

THE PRESIDENT arrives off-stage announcement area.

Announcement (off-stage)

11:50 a.m. THE PRESIDENT proceeds on-stage and takes seat.

* Briefing and discussion of SDI development

12:10 p.m. * Remarks

OPEN PRESS COVERAGE

12:35 p.m. THE PRESIDENT concludes remarks and proceeds to holding room.

THE PRESIDENT arrives holding room.

12:40 p.m. THE PRESIDENT proceeds to motorcade for boarding.

12:45 p.m. THE PRESIDENT departs Building M-3 en route landing zone.

12:50 p.m. THE PRESIDENT arrives landing zone and proceeds on board Marine One.

12:55 p.m. MARINE ONE departs Waterton landing zone en route Denver, Colorado.

Flight Time: 15 mins.

1:10 p.m. MARINE ONE arrives Denver, Colorado.

THE PRESIDENT deplanes and proceeds on board Air Force One.

1:15 p.m. MST AIR FORCE ONE departs Denver, Colorado en route Pt. Mugu Naval Air Station.

Flight Time: 2 hrs. 15 mins. (w/o interchange)
Time Change: - 1 hr.
Food Service: tbd

2:30 p.m. PST AIR FORCE ONE arrives Pt. Mugu Naval Air Station.

OPEN PRESS COVERAGE
CLOSED ARRIVAL/DEPARTURE

THE PRESIDENT deplanes and proceeds to Marine One for boarding.

2:35 p.m. MARINE ONE departs Pt. Mugu Naval Air Station en route Rancho del Cielo.

Flight Time: 35 mins.

3:10 p.m. MARINE ONE arrives Rancho del Cielo.

THE WHITE HOUSE

WASHINGTON

November 19, 1987

MEMORANDUM FOR HOWARD H. BAKER, JR.

THROUGH: THOMAS C. GRISCOM

FROM: JAMES L. HOOLEY

SUBJECT: PRESIDENTIAL TRIP TO DENVER, COLORADO
TUESDAY, NOVEMBER 24, 1987

N.A. - 4:00 pm

Event Concept

En route to Santa Barbara, California, on Tuesday, November 24, 1987, the President will visit the Martin Marietta Denver Aeronautics Facility outside of Denver, Colorado to highlight his commitment to a strategic defense for America.

At the facility the President will receive a classified, closed briefing centering on Martin Marietta's Zenith Star project. Although only one component of the complete SDI program, Zenith Star is a principal element of our space based, directed energy defensive system.

The President will also take part in an expanded panel briefing, before approximately 2000 Martin Marietta employees. This panel will feature several noted, objective, scientific authorities whose remarks are intended to underscore the defensive nature of the program, the viability of SDI in general, and to counter reports that the program remains purely notional and unlikely to work. This panel presentation will be open to the press.

The President will respond to the panel briefing with an address endorsing the continued research of SDI, generally emphasizing that the program is workable, defensive and realistic. The President has the opportunity to convey SDI as providing strength and toughness in bargaining, and to stress its future-oriented, defensive nature.

It is necessary to note that an early decision as to a foul weather plan is highly recommended. In the event that helicopter travel is prohibited by weather, there would be unusually lengthy drive times. Since driving could potentially put the President in the car for up to 3 hours, I would recommend that the trip be automatically postponed if it is determined that we cannot fly. I will discuss this issue with Tom Griscom in more detail.

05/19/87 4:00 p.m.

Finally, we will have less helicopter seats in Colorado than on a normal trip. Although we will make every attempt to accommodate all passengers, we may need to request that some people remain on board Air Force One for the duration of the President's visit to Martin Marietta.

A similar memorandum will be forwarded to Rhett Dawson for submission to the President unless otherwise instructed.

cc: K. Duberstein
W. Ball
F. Carlucci
R. Dawson
F. Donatelli
M. Fitzwater
N. Risque
D. Chew
J. Courtemanche
T. Dolan
C. Powell
R. Range
F. Ryan
J. Tuck
J. Kuhn
M. Weinberg

05/19/87 4:00 p.m.

THE WHITE HOUSE

WASHINGTON

PROPOSED DRAFT SUMMARY SCHEDULE OF THE PRESIDENT

TUESDAY, NOVEMBER 24, 1987

8:40 a.m. THE PRESIDENT proceeds to Marine One for boarding.

OPEN PRESS COVERAGE

8:45 a.m. MARINE ONE departs the South Lawn.

Flight Time: 10 mins.

8:55 a.m. MARINE ONE arrives Andrews Air Force Base.

OPEN PRESS COVERAGE
CLOSED ARRIVAL/DEPARTURE

THE PRESIDENT deplanes and proceeds to Air Force One for boarding.

9:00 a.m. EST AIR FORCE ONE departs Andrews Air Force Base en route Denver, Colorado.

Flight Time: 3 hrs. and 30 mins.
Time Change: - 2 hrs.
Food Service: Lunch

10:30 a.m. MST AIR FORCE ONE arrives Denver, Colorado.

OPEN PRESS COVERAGE

THE PRESIDENT deplanes and proceeds to Marine One for boarding.

10:35 a.m. MARINE ONE departs Denver, Colorado en route Waterton, Colorado.

Flight Time: 15 mins.

10:50 a.m. MARINE ONE arrives Martin Marietta Denver Aerospace landing zone, Waterton, Colorado.

OPEN PRESS COVERAGE

05/19/87 4:00 p.m.

THE PRESIDENT deplanes and proceeds to motorcade for boarding.

10:55 a.m. THE PRESIDENT departs landing zone en route Rapid Retargeting and Precision Pointing Laboratory.

11:00 a.m. THE PRESIDENT arrives Rapid Retargeting and Precision Pointing Laboratory and proceeds inside.

11:05 a.m. * Receive briefing on SDI development

11:25 a.m. * View demonstration of R2P2 device

No Press

OFFICIAL PHOTOGRAPHER ONLY

11:35 a.m. THE PRESIDENT concludes briefing and proceeds to motorcade for boarding.

11:40 a.m. THE PRESIDENT departs Rapid Retargeting and Precision Pointing Laboratory en route Building M-3.

11:45 a.m. THE PRESIDENT arrives Building M-3 and proceeds to holding room.

THE PRESIDENT arrives holding room.

THE PRESIDENT proceeds to off-stage announcement area.

THE PRESIDENT arrives off-stage announcement area.

Announcement (off-stage)

11:50 a.m. THE PRESIDENT proceeds on-stage and takes seat.

* Briefing and discussion of SDI development — 20 minutes Panel Discussion

12:10 p.m. * Remarks

OPEN PRESS COVERAGE 25 minutes for Rmks

12:35 p.m. THE PRESIDENT concludes remarks and proceeds to holding room.

THE PRESIDENT arrives holding room.

12:40 p.m. THE PRESIDENT proceeds to motorcade for boarding.

Secy. Designate Carlucci ?

05/19/87 4:00 p.m.

12:45 p.m. THE PRESIDENT departs Building M-3 en route landing zone.

12:50 p.m. THE PRESIDENT arrives landing zone and proceeds on board Marine One.

12:55 p.m. MARINE ONE departs Waterton landing zone en route Denver, Colorado.

Flight Time: 15 mins.

1:10 p.m. MARINE ONE arrives Denver, Colorado.

THE PRESIDENT deplanes and proceeds on board Air Force One.

1:15 p.m. MST AIR FORCE ONE departs Denver, Colorado en route Pt. Mugu Naval Air Station.

Flight Time: 2 hrs. 15 mins. (w/o interchange)
Time Change: - 1 hr.
Food Service: tbd

2:30 p.m. PST AIR FORCE ONE arrives Pt. Mugu Naval Air Station.

OPEN PRESS COVERAGE
CLOSED ARRIVAL/DEPARTURE

THE PRESIDENT deplanes and proceeds to Marine One for boarding.

2:35 p.m. MARINE ONE departs Pt. Mugu Naval Air Station en route Rancho del Cielo.

Flight Time: 35 mins.

3:10 p.m. MARINE ONE arrives Rancho del Cielo.

own we remove, they will give up four. I wish I could negotiate a deal like that with Congress.

Recently, all seven living former Secretaries of Defense were asked if they would recommend this agreement to the President if they were still in office. All seven said yes -- it's a good agreement.

It would, however, be hasty to assume that we're at the point where we are ready to put pen to paper and sign the treaty. For one thing, in one important area -- verification -- the treaty is not yet complete. Now, neither on this issue nor any other do I hold any illusions about the Soviets. It's said that for them, past arms control treaties were like diets. The second day was always the best, because that's when they broke them.

Any treaty I agree to must provide for effective verification, including on-site inspection of facilities before and during reduction and short-notice inspection afterwards. The verification regime we have put forward in Geneva is the most stringent in the history of arms control negotiations. I will not settle for anything less.

We are also moving ahead with an agreement on reducing our two nations' strategic arsenals by half. Our Geneva negotiators have made progress. The Soviets must, however, stop holding strategic offensive missile reductions hostage to measures that would cripple our research and development of S.D.I.

It's no longer a secret that the Soviet Union has spent billions upon billions of dollars developing their own anti-ballistic missile defense. Research and development in some

parts of the "Cosmos" weapons program began more than 15 years ago. Today it includes everything from killer-satellites to the modernized A.B.M. defenses that ring Moscow. More that 10,000 scientists are working on military lasers alone -- with thousands more developing other advanced technologies such as particle beam and kinetic energy weapons.

The Soviet "Cosmos" weapons program dwarfs S.D.I. Yet some in Congress would bind us to an overly-restrictive interpretation of the A.B.M. treaty that would effectively block development of S.D.I., giving the Soviets a monopoly in anti-ballistic missile defenses. This effort to tie our hands makes even less sense when the Soviets aren't abiding by the A.B.M. treaty. Whatever interpretation you give the A.B.M. treaty, broad or strict, the Soviets are violating it. Two of the A.B.M. treaty's biggest proponents in this country -- Robert McNamara and McGeorge Bundy -- agree that the Soviet construction of the large, phase-array radar at Krasnoyarsk is almost certainly a violation of A.B.M.

Tying our hands to a treaty that the other side feels perfectly free to violate amounts to nothing more than unilateral disarmament. And as I promised Cap the other day in his farewell at the Pentagon -- we're not unilaterally disarming in this area, or any other area.

A recent report released by the Department of Defense called "The Soviet Space Challenge" warns that the Soviets are developing a space-launch capability much greater than that of the United States. The report estimates that the Soviet launch

requirements will be two to three times our own, while their proposed launch capability between 1990 and 2005 is nearly double any requirement we can identify. "Clearly," the Secretary of Defense states, "the Soviet program points in one direction -- the methodical pursuit of a war-fighting capability in space."

This report raises an ominous specter. Together with the long-standing "Cosmos" weapons program and the completion, with the construction of the Krasnoyarsk radar, of an early warning and tracking system -- the Soviets may soon be in a position to "break out" of the A.B.M. Treaty, to confront us with a fait accompli which we will be totally and dangerously unprepared for.

There has been a strange tendency by some in Congress to discuss S.D.I. as if its funding could be determined by purely domestic considerations, unconnected to what the Soviets are doing. S.D.I. is too important to be subject to congressional log-rolling. It is a vital insurance policy, a necessary part of any national security strategy that includes deep reductions in strategic weapons. In decades to come, it will underwrite all of us against Soviet cheating on both strategic and intermediate-range missile agreements. It goes hand-in-hand with arms reductions. We cannot -- we will not -- bargain it away to get strategic arms reductions.

S.D.I. will also protect us against accidental missile launches and ballistic missile threats -- whether with nuclear, conventional, or chemical warheads -- from outlaw regimes. In the decades ahead, missile technology will proliferate, just as nuclear-weapons technology already has. We can't be sure just

who will get it -- how competent they will be or how rational. We must have an insurance policy against that day, as well.

No, S.D.I. is not a bargaining chip. It is a cornerstone of our security strategy for the 1990's and beyond. We will research it. We will develop it. And when it is ready, we will deploy it. Remember this: If both sides have defenses, it can be a safer world. But if we leave the Soviets with a monopoly in this vital area, our security will be gravely jeopardized. We must not let that happen.

My talks with General Secretary Gorbachev will cover the full range of U.S.-Soviet relations -- including human rights in the Soviet Union, exchanges between our peoples, and Soviet involvement in regional conflicts such as in Afghanistan, Angola, and Nicaragua.

Let me just say a few more words about two of those subjects -- first human rights. There has been a lot of speculation about glasnost recently. How sincere an effort is it to reform Soviet society. Will this first breadth of openness be followed by real freedoms. Those of us who have lived through the last 70 years remember earlier moments of promise in Soviet history -- temporary thaws soon frozen over by the cold winds of oppression.

But we can certainly also look for signs of hope. One recent sign came from Joseph Terelya, the brave Ukrainian Catholic human rights activist, who was released from the Soviet Union in September after 20 years in Soviet labor camps, prisons, and psychiatric hospitals. Previously, Mr. Terelya had feared

ANY TREATY I AGREE TO MUST PROVIDE ... VERIFICATION, INCLUDING ON-SITE INSPECTION OF FACILITIES BEFORE AND DURING REDUCTIONS AND SHORT-NOTICE INSPECTIONS AFTERWARDS. THE VERIFICATION REGIME WE HAVE PUT FORWARD IN GENEVA IS THE MOST STRINGENT IN THE HISTORY OF ARMS CONTROL NEGOTIATIONS. I WILL NOT SETTLE FOR ANYTHING LESS.

WE ARE ALSO PRESSING NOW FOR AN AGREEMENT ON REDUCING OUR TWO NATIONS' STRATEGIC ARSENALS BY ONE-HALF. OUR GENEVA NEGOTIATORS HAVE MADE PROGRESS. THE SOVIETS MUST, HOWEVER, STOP HOLDING STRATEGIC OFFENSIVE MISSILE REDUCTIONS HOSTAGE TO MEASURES THAT WOULD CRIPPLE OUR INVESTIGATION OF A STRATEGIC DEFENSE AGAINST BALLISTIC MISSILES -- S.D.I.

FROM THE KRASNOYARSK RADAR FACILITY, WHOSE VERY CONSTRUCTION VIOLATED THE 1972 A.B.M. TREATY THAT THE SOVIETS SO VOCALLY CLAIM THEY WANT TO PRESERVE, TO THEIR MODERNIZED DEPLOYMENTS AROUND MOSCOW OF THE WORLD's ONLY A.B.M. DEFENSES, THE SOVIET UNION's OWN S.D.I. PROJECTS HAVE BECOME BIG NEWS THROUGHOUT THE WORLD IN RECENT MONTHS. THE SOVIETS HAVE PUT BILLIONS INTO THEIR PROGRAM. THEY HAVE MORE THAN 10,000 SCIENTISTS WORKING ON MILITARY LASERS ALONE. WE KNOW THIS. THEY KNOW WE KNOW. WE KNOW THEY KNOW WE KNOW. IT's TIME FOR THEM TO STOP THE CHARADE, AND ADMIT THEIR OWN DEEP INVOLVEMENT IN STRATEGIC DEFENSE WORK.

FOR US, S.D.I. IS A VITAL INSURANCE POLICY -- A NECESSARY PART OF ANY NATIONAL SECURITY STRATEGY THAT INCLUDES DEEP REDUCTIONS IN STRATEGIC WEAPONS. IT WILL HELP PROTECT OUR ALLIES, TOO. IN DECADES TO COME, IT WILL UNDERWRITE ALL OF US AGAINST SOVIET CHEATING ON BOTH STRATEGIC AND INTERMEDIATE-RANGE MISSILE AGREEMENTS. IT GOES HAND-IN-HAND WITH ARMS REDUCTIONS. WE CANNOT -- WE WILL NOT -- BARGAIN IT AWAY TO GET STRATEGIC ARMS REDUCTIONS.

S.D.I. WILL ALSO PROTECT US AGAINST ACCIDENTAL MISSILE LAUNCHES AND BALLISTIC MISSILE THREATS -- WHETHER WITH NUCLEAR, CONVENTIONAL, OR CHEMICAL WARHEADS -- FROM OUTLAW REGIMES. IN THE DECADES AHEAD, MISSILE TECHNOLOGY WILL PROLIFERATE, JUST AS NUCLEAR-WEAPONS TECHNOLOGY ALREADY HAS. WE CAN'T BE SURE JUST WHO WILL GET IT -- HOW COMPETENT THEY WILL BE OR HOW RATIONAL. WE MUST HAVE AN INSURANCE POLICY AGAINST THAT DAY, AS WELL.

NO, S.D.I. IS NOT A BARGAINING CHIP. IT IS A CORNERSTONE OF OUR SECURITY STRATEGY FOR THE 1990's AND BEYOND. WE WILL RESEARCH IT. WE WILL DEVELOP IT. AND WHEN IT IS READY, WE WILL DEPLOY IT. REMEMBER THIS: IF <u>BOTH</u> SIDES HAVE DEFENSES, IT CAN BE A SAFER WORLD. BUT IF WE LEAVE THE SOVIETS WITH A MONOPOLY IN THIS VITAL AREA, OUR SECURITY WILL BE GRAVELY JEOPARDIZED. WE MUST NOT LET THAT HAPPEN.