

Ronald Reagan Presidential Library
Digital Library Collections

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

Collection: Speechwriting, White House Office of:
Research Office, 1981-1989
Folder Title: 12/12/1987 Radio Talk: Summit
(Teresa/Josh)
Box: 358

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

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

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

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

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

T.R.

(Gilder/ARD)
December 11, 1987
12:00 p.m.

PRESIDENTIAL RADIO TALK: SUMMIT
SATURDAY, DECEMBER 12, 1987

My fellow Americans: As you know, we had an important visitor in Washington this week. General Secretary Gorbachev was in town for only 3 days, but, though our time was short, we accomplished much.

Now, with all the reports of I.N.F., I.C.B.M.'s, and S.D.I. you've been hearing the last few days, I wouldn't be surprised if some people were a little bit confused by all those letters. It sounds like alphabet soup. So let me just begin by trying to put all this into English that everybody can understand.

I.N.F. stands for Intermediate-range Nuclear Forces. They include nuclear missiles deployed in the Soviet Union and Europe. When the Soviets first started deploying new I.N.F. missiles in the 1970's, the triple-warhead SS-20's, they represented a totally new nuclear threat to our friends in Europe and Asia for which we had no comparable counter.

In response, despite intense pressure exerted by the Soviet Union on Europe, NATO decided in 1979 that we would deploy a limited number of comparable missiles and, at the same time, push hard in negotiations to do away with this new nuclear threat.

In 1981, I first proposed what would come to be called the "zero option." It called for the complete elimination of these U.S. and Soviet missiles on both sides. The Soviets stonewalled. At first, many called it a mere propaganda ploy, some even here in this country. But we were patient and persistent. For the

first time in history, in the treaty that General Secretary Gorbachev and I just signed, arms control has been replaced by arms reduction. Actually, I should say arms elimination, because with this treaty, an entire class of I.N.F. missiles -- both U.S. and Soviet -- will be destroyed. Now, the Soviets presently have many more I.N.F. missiles than we do, so they'll be destroying some 1,600 deployed warheads, while we destroy about 400.

Now that the treaty has been signed, it will be submitted to the Senate for the next step, the ratification process. I met with the leadership of Congress yesterday morning, and I am confident that the Senate will now act in an expeditious way to fulfill its duty under our Constitution.

So, I hope in the near future, I.N.F. will be one part of the alphabet soup you won't have to remember. Other letters you'll hear more about are S.T.A.R.T.: Strategic Arms Reduction Talks, because we have made progress toward 50 percent reductions in strategic nuclear arsenals.

This could be another historic achievement -- provided the Soviets stop trying to hold it hostage to restrictions on S.D.I. S.D.I. stands for our Strategic Defense Initiative, the high-tech defense we are investigating to protect America and its allies against ballistic-missile attack.

When I met with General Secretary Gorbachev in Geneva in 1985 and in Reykjavik, Iceland last year, he exerted every bit of pressure he could to try to make us give up S.D.I. Well, I, of course, had to disappoint him each time. Building a defense against nuclear weapons is a moral as well as strategic

imperative, and we will never give it up. Our bottom line on S.D.I. is simple: We will research it, we will test it, and, when it is ready, we will deploy it.

The Soviets have persisted in efforts to limit our vital testing in this area. But providing a strategic defense is too important to restrict the promise it holds for future generations. Defense; not just offense. That is the promise S.D.I. holds.

The fact is, and I'm afraid most of us in this country aren't fully aware of this fact, the United States presently has to rely on a policy in which our nations hold each other hostage to nuclear terror and destruction. This is an intolerable situation. We will move forward with S.D.I. -- it is our moral duty.

Now, I don't want you to think that this summit was taken up exclusively with arms reduction. I talked extensively with Mr. Gorbachev about our insistence that his policy of "glasnost" become more than a slogan, that we begin to see real progress on human rights.

As I emphasized to Mr. Gorbachev, nothing would convince us of the sincerity of "glasnost" so much as seeing progress in emigration, release of political prisoners, and allowing his people their most basic right to worship their Maker in peace, free of fear.

Finally, we talked directly about regional issues such as Afghanistan, Iran-Iraq, Angola, Cambodia, and Nicaragua. We stressed the urgency of action between our two countries in order

to bring more cooperation to our efforts to resolve these conflicts on terms that promote peace and freedom.

So, we have a long road to travel. But we've taken important steps. With your help we'll make that journey.

Until next week, thanks for listening and God bless you.

(Gilder/ARD)
December 11, 1987
11:00 a.m.

PRESIDENTIAL RADIO TALK: SUMMIT
SATURDAY, DECEMBER 12, 1987

My fellow Americans:

As you know, we had an important visitor in Washington this week. General Secretary Gorbachev was in town for only 3 days, but, though our time was short, we accomplished much.

Now, with all the reports of I.N.F., I.C.B.M.'s, and S.D.I. you've been hearing the last few days, I wouldn't be surprised if some people were a little bit confused by all those letters. It sounds like alphabet soup. So let me just begin by trying to put all this into English that everybody can understand.

I.N.F. stands for Intermediate-range Nuclear Forces. They include nuclear missiles deployed in the Soviet Union and Europe. When the Soviets first started deploying new I.N.F. missiles in the 1970's, the triple-warhead SS-20's, they represented a totally new nuclear threat to our friends in Europe and Asia for which we had no comparable counter.

In response, despite intense pressure exerted by the Soviet Union on Europe, NATO decided in 1979 that we would deploy a limited number of comparable missiles and, at the same time, push hard in negotiations to do away with this new nuclear threat.

In 1981, I first proposed what would come to be called the "zero option." It called for the complete elimination of these U.S. and Soviet missiles on both sides. The Soviets stonewalled. *Many* ~~They~~ called it a mere propaganda ploy, and *some* ~~many~~ in this country agreed. But we were patient and persistent. For the first time

in history, in the treaty that General Secretary Gorbachev and I just signed, arms control has been replaced by arms reduction. Actually, I should say arms elimination, because with this treaty, an entire class of I.N.F. missiles -- both U.S. and Soviet -- will be destroyed. The Soviets will be required to destroy not only their entire force of SS-20's and SS-4's, but also their shorter-range I.N.F. missiles, the SS-12's and SS-23's. Now, that's a lot of numbers, but what it means is this: Since the Soviets presently have many more I.N.F. missiles than we do, they'll be destroying some 1,600 deployed warheads, while we destroy about 400. That's four of theirs to each one of ours.

So, I hope in the near future, I.N.F. will be one part of the alphabet soup you won't have to remember. Other letters you'll hear more about are S.T.A.R.T.: Strategic Arms Reduction Talks, because we have made progress toward 50 percent reductions in strategic nuclear arsenals.

This could be another historic achievement -- provided the Soviets stop trying to hold it hostage to restrictions on S.D.I. S.D.I. stands for our Strategic Defense Initiative, the high-tech defense we are investigating to protect America and its allies against ballistic-missile attack.

When I met with General Secretary Gorbachev in Geneva in 1985 and in Reykjavik, Iceland last year, he exerted every bit of pressure he could to try to make us give up S.D.I. Well, I, of course, had to disappoint him each time. Building a defense against nuclear weapons is a moral as well as strategic

imperative, and we will never give it up. Our bottom line on S.D.I. is simple: We will research it, we will test it, and, when it is ready, we will deploy it.

The Soviets have persisted in efforts to limit our vital testing in this area. But providing a strategic defense is too important to restrict the promise it holds for future generations. Defense; not just offense. That is the promise S.D.I. holds.

The fact is, and I'm afraid most of us in this country aren't fully aware of this fact, the United States presently has to rely on a policy in which our nations hold each other hostage to nuclear terror and destruction. This is an intolerable situation. We will move forward with S.D.I. -- it is our moral duty.

Now, I don't want you to think that this summit was taken up exclusively with arms reduction. I talked extensively with Mr. Gorbachev about our insistence that his policy of "glasnost" become more than a slogan, that we begin to see real progress on human rights.

As I emphasized to Mr. Gorbachev, nothing would convince us of the sincerity of "glasnost" so much as seeing progress in emigration, release of political prisoners, and allowing his people their most basic right to worship their Maker in peace, free of fear.

Finally, we talked directly about regional issues such as Afghanistan, Iran-Iraq, Angola, Cambodia, and Nicaragua. We stressed the urgency of action between our two countries in order

to bring more cooperation to our efforts to resolve these conflicts on terms that promote peace and freedom.

So, we have a long road to travel. But we've taken important steps. With your help we'll make that journey.

Until next week, then, thank you very much and God bless you.

(Gilder/ARD)
December 10, 1987
6:30 p.m.

PRESIDENTIAL RADIO TALK: SUMMIT
SATURDAY, DECEMBER 12, 1987

My fellow Americans: As you know, we had an important visitor in Washington this week. General Secretary Gorbachev was in town for only 3 days, but, though our time was short, we accomplished much.

Now, with all the reports of I.N.F., I.C.B.M.'s, and S.D.I. you've been hearing the last few days, I wouldn't be surprised if some people were a little bit confused by all those letters. It sounds like the alphabet soup. So let me just begin by trying to put all this into English that everybody can understand.

I.N.F. stands for Intermediate-range Nuclear Forces. They include nuclear missiles deployed in the Soviet Union and Europe. When the Soviets first started deploying new I.N.F. missiles in the 1970's, the triple-warhead SS-20's, they represented a totally new nuclear threat to our friends in Europe and Asia for which we had no comparable counter. In response, despite intense pressure exerted by the Soviet Union on Europe, NATO decided in 1979 that we would deploy a limited number of comparable missiles and, at the same time, push hard in negotiations to do away with this new nuclear threat.

In 1981, I first proposed what would come to be called the "zero option." It called for the complete elimination of these U.S. and Soviet missiles on both sides. The Soviets stonewalled, but we were patient and persistent. For the first time in history, in the treaty that General Secretary Gorbachev and I

just signed, arms control has been replaced by arms reduction. Actually, I should say arms elimination, because with this treaty, an entire class of I.N.F. missiles -- both U.S. and Soviet -- will be destroyed. Now, the Soviets presently have many more of these missiles than we do, so they'll be destroying some 1,600 deployed warheads, while we destroy about 400.

So, I hope in the near future, I.N.F. will be one part of the alphabet soup you won't have to remember. Other letters you'll hear more about are S.T.A.R.T.: Strategic Arms Reduction Talks, because we have made progress toward 50 percent reductions in strategic nuclear arsenals. This could be another historic achievement -- provided the Soviets stop trying to hold it hostage to restrictions on S.D.I. S.D.I. stands for our Strategic Defense Initiative, the high-tech defense we are investigating to protect America and its allies against ballistic-missile attack. When I met with General Secretary Gorbachev in Geneva in 1985 and in Reykjavik, Iceland last year, he exerted every bit of pressure he could to try to make us give up S.D.I. Well, I, of course, had to disappoint him each time. Building a defense against nuclear weapons is a moral as well as strategic imperative, and we will never give it up. Our bottom line on S.D.I. is simple: We will research it, we will test it, and, when it is ready, we will deploy it.

The Soviets have persisted in efforts to limit our vital testing in this area. But providing a strategic defense is too important to restrict the promise it holds for future

generations. Defense; not just offense. That is the promise S.D.I. holds.

The fact is, and I'm afraid most of us in this country aren't fully aware of this fact, the United States presently has to rely on a policy in which our nations hold each other hostage to nuclear terror and destruction. This is an intolerable situation. We will move forward with S.D.I. -- it is our moral duty.

Now, I don't want you to think that this summit was taken up exclusively with arms reduction. I talked extensively with Mr. Gorbachev about our insistence that his policy of "glasnost" become more than a slogan, that we begin to see real progress on human rights. As I emphasized to Mr. Gorbachev, nothing would convince us of the sincerity of "glasnost" so much as seeing progress in emigration, release of political prisoners, and allowing his people their most basic right to worship their Maker in peace, free of fear.

Finally, we talked directly about Afghanistan ^{regional issues such as} ~~and other~~ *Iran-Iraq, Angola, Cambodia & Nicaragua*
~~potential regional crises, including the Middle East and the Iran-Iraq war. We stressed the need to set a date certain -- next year -- for their total withdrawal from Afghanistan, to talk to the freedom fighters, and to allow self determination for the~~

~~Afghan people. We stressed the urgency of action in the United Nations Security Council to bring Iran to end its aggression. efforts to resolve these conflicts on terms that promote peace and freedom. The Soviet response so far is not sufficient, but the message we conveyed was clear.~~

So, we have a long road to travel. But we've taken important steps. With your help we'll make that journey.

Thank you very much and God bless you.

TR.
(Gilder/ARD)
December 10, 1987
6:30 p.m. RR

PRESIDENTIAL RADIO TALK: SUMMIT
SATURDAY, DECEMBER 12, 1987

My fellow Americans: As you know, we had an important visitor in Washington this week. General Secretary Gorbachev was in town for only 3 days, but, though our time was short, we accomplished much.

Now, with all the reports of I.N.F., I.C.B.M.'s, and S.D.I. you've been hearing the last few days, I wouldn't be surprised if some people were a little bit confused by all those letters. It sounds like the alphabet soup. So let me just begin by trying to put all this into English that everybody can understand.

I.N.F. stands for Intermediate-range Nuclear Forces. They include nuclear missiles deployed in the Soviet Union and Europe. When the Soviets first started deploying new I.N.F. missiles in the 1970's, the triple-warhead SS-20's, they represented a totally new nuclear threat to our friends in Europe and Asia for which we had no comparable counter. In response, despite intense pressure exerted by the Soviet Union on Europe, NATO decided in 1979 that we would deploy a limited number of comparable missiles and, at the same time, push hard in negotiations to do away with this new nuclear threat.

In 1981, I first proposed what would come to be called the "zero option." It called for the complete elimination of these U.S. and Soviet missiles on both sides. The Soviets stonewalled, but we were patient and persistent. For the first time in history, in the treaty that General Secretary Gorbachev and I

just signed, arms control has been replaced by arms reduction. Actually, I should say arms elimination, because with this treaty, an entire class of I.N.F. missiles -- both U.S. and Soviet -- will be destroyed. Now, the Soviets presently have many more of these missiles than we do, so they'll be destroying some 1,600 deployed warheads, while we destroy about 400.

So, I hope in the near future, I.N.F. will be one part of the alphabet soup you won't have to remember. Other letters you'll hear more about are S.T.A.R.T.: Strategic Arms Reduction Talks, because we have made progress toward 50 percent reductions in strategic nuclear arsenals. This could be another historic achievement -- provided the Soviets stop trying to hold it hostage to restrictions on S.D.I. S.D.I. stands for our Strategic Defense Initiative, the high-tech defense we are investigating to protect America and its allies against ballistic-missile attack. When I met with General Secretary Gorbachev in Geneva in 1985 and in Reykjavik, Iceland last year, he exerted every bit of pressure he could to try to make us give up S.D.I. Well, I, of course, had to disappoint him each time. Building a defense against nuclear weapons is a moral as well as strategic imperative, and we will never give it up. Our bottom line on S.D.I. is simple: We will research it, we will test it, and, when it is ready, we will deploy it.

The Soviets have persisted in efforts to limit our vital testing in this area. But providing a strategic defense is too important to restrict the promise it holds for future

generations. Defense; not just offense. That is the promise S.D.I. holds.

The fact is, and I'm afraid most of us in this country aren't fully aware of this fact, the United States presently has to rely on a policy in which our nations hold each other hostage to nuclear terror and destruction. This is an intolerable situation. We will move forward with S.D.I. -- it is our moral duty.

Now, I don't want you to think that this summit was taken up exclusively with arms reduction. I talked extensively with Mr. Gorbachev about our insistence that his policy of "glasnost" become more than a slogan, that we begin to see real progress on human rights. As I emphasized to Mr. Gorbachev, nothing would convince us of the sincerity of "glasnost" so much as seeing progress in emigration, release of political prisoners, and allowing his people their most basic right to worship their Maker in peace, free of fear.

Finally, we talked directly about Afghanistan and other potential regional crises, including the Middle East and the Iran-Iraq war. We stressed the need to set a date certain -- next year -- for their total withdrawal from Afghanistan, to talk to the freedom fighters, and to allow self-determination for the Afghan people. We stressed the urgency of action in the United Nations Security Council to bring Iran to end its aggression. The Soviet response so far is not sufficient, but the message we conveyed was clear.

So, we have a long road to travel. But we've taken important steps. With your help we'll make that journey.

Thank you very much and God bless you.

(Gilder/ARD)
December 10, 1987
6:00 p.m.

PRESIDENTIAL RADIO TALK: SUMMIT
SATURDAY, DECEMBER 12, 1987

My fellow Americans: As you know, we had an important visitor in Washington this week. General Secretary Gorbachev was in town for only 3 days, but, though our time was short, we accomplished much.

Now, with all the reports of I.N.F., I.C.B.M.'s, and S.D.I. you've been hearing the last few days, I wouldn't be surprised if some people were a little bit confused by all those letters. It sounds like the alphabet soup. So let me just begin by trying to put all this into English that everybody can understand.

I.N.F. stands for Intermediate-range Nuclear Forces. They include nuclear missiles deployed in the Soviet Union and Europe. When the Soviets first started deploying new I.N.F. missiles in the 1970's, the triple-warhead SS-20's, they represented a totally new nuclear threat to our friends in Europe and Asia for which we had no comparable ~~deterrent~~. In response, despite intense pressure exerted by the Soviet Union on Europe, NATO decided in 1979 that we would deploy a limited number of comparable missiles and, at the same time, push hard in negotiations to do away with this new nuclear threat.

In 1981, I first proposed what would come to be called the "zero option." It called for the complete elimination of these U.S. and Soviet missiles on both sides. The Soviets stonewalled, but we were patient and persistent. For the first time in history, in the treaty that General Secretary Gorbachev and I

TR

WHITE HOUSE STAFFING MEMORANDUM

DATE: 12/09/87 ACTION/CONCURRENCE/COMMENT DUE BY: 2:00 p.m. Thursday 12/10

SUBJECT: PRESIDENTIAL RADIO TALK: SUMMIT

(12/09 6:30 p.m. draft)

	ACTION	FYI		ACTION	FYI
VICE PRESIDENT	☐	☒	FITZWATER	☐	☒
BAKER	☐	☒	GRISCOM	☒	☐
DUBERSTEIN	☐	☒	HOBBS	☐	☐
MILLER - OMB	☐	☐	HOOLEY	☐	☒
BALL	☒	☐	KING	☐	☐
BAUER	☐	☐	RANGE	☒	☐
[REDACTED] POWELL	☒	☐	RISQUE	☒	☐
CRIBB	☐	☐	RYAN	☐	☐
CRIPPEN	☐	☐	SPRINKEL	☐	☐
CULVAHOUSE	☒	☐	TUTTLE	☐	☐
DAWSON	☐	☒	DOLAN	☐	☒
DONATELLI	☐	☐		☐	☐

REMARKS:

Please provide any comments/recommendations to Tony Dolan by 2:00 p.m. on Thursday, December ~~10~~¹⁰th, with an info copy to my office. Thanks.

RESPONSE:

December 10, 1987

NSC staff concurs, with changes, in the attached Presidential radio talk.

Bill Courtney
Paul Schott Stevens
Executive Secretary

cc: Rhett Dawson

Rhett Dawson
Ext. 2702

(Gilder/ARD)
December 9, 1987
6:30 p.m.

PRESIDENTIAL RADIO TALK: SUMMIT
SATURDAY, DECEMBER 12, 1987

Need to trim
arms control
stuff to make
room for (brief)
regional discussion
at end.

My fellow Americans:

As you know, we had an important visitor in Washington this week. General Secretary Gorbachev was in town for only 3 days, but, though our time was short, we accomplished much.

Now, with all the reports of I.N.F. ~~(s)~~, I.C.B.M.'s, and S.D.I. you've been hearing the last few days, I wouldn't be surprised if some people were a little bit confused by all those letters. ^{It sounds like} ~~We call it the~~ alphabet soup. So let me just begin by trying to put all this into English that everybody can understand.

I.N.F. stands for Intermediate ^{-range} Nuclear Forces. They ^{include} ~~are~~ ^{deployed} ~~installed~~ in the Soviet Union and Europe. When the Soviets first started deploying ^{new INF} ~~these~~ ^{in triple-warhead SS-20's,} missiles in the 1970's, they represented a totally new nuclear threat to Europe and ^{our friends in} ~~Japan~~ ^{Asia} for which we had no comparable deterrent.

In response, despite intense pressure ~~political pressure~~ ^{decided in 1979 that} exerted by the Soviet Union on Europe, NATO ^{we would deploy a limited number of comparable missiles} ~~began implementation of its "two-track" policy.~~ We would deploy our own I.N.F.'s and, at the same time, push hard in negotiations to do away with this new ^{threat.} ~~and unprecedented~~ nuclear escalation.

In 1981, I first proposed what would come to be called the "zero option." It called for the complete elimination of these ^{US and Soviet missiles} ~~I.N.F.'s~~ on both sides. The ^{Soviets stone-walled} ~~reaction to this proposal was mixed,~~

Term not
used in
plural

Accuracy

~~to say the least~~ ~~the Soviets~~ ^[They may] called it a mere propaganda ploy, and many ~~in the media~~ in this country agreed.]

Optional cut

But we were patient and persistent, ~~and the result is that~~ ^{in the treaty that G-S Gorbachev and I just signed,} For the first time in history, arms control has been replaced by arms reduction. Actually, I should say arms elimination, because with this treaty, an entire class of I.N.F. ^{missiles} -- both U.S. and Soviet -- will be destroyed. Now, the Soviets presently have many more of these missiles than we do, so they'll be destroying some 1,600 ^{deployed warheads} ~~missiles~~, while we destroy ^{about} 400.

When this treaty takes effect, the world will be witness to a remarkable sight. ~~You see, each side must verify that the~~ ^{we insisted on being able to} ~~Soviets~~ ^{their INF and don't build new ones.} ~~actually destroyed its missiles.~~ So, ~~after we remove~~ ^{inspection teams will even take up residence in each other's} the warheads, we will start firing off our I.N.F. missiles from ~~the West Coast of Europe into the Atlantic Ocean.~~ ^{country to carry out continuing on-site inspection.} ~~Simultaneously, the Soviets will begin launching their missiles~~ ^{And we will have frequent on-site inspections.} eastward, where they will burn out and fall harmlessly into the wastes of Siberia.

^{I hope} So, ~~hopefully~~ in the near future, I.N.F. will be one part of the alphabet soup you won't have to remember. ^{Other letters you'll hear more about are START: Strategic Arms Reduction Talks, because we have made progress toward approximately 50% reductions in our Strategic Nuclear Arsenal.} ~~The other letters~~ ^{This could be another} ~~historical achievement -- provided the Soviets stop trying to hold it hostage to~~ ^{restrictions on S.D.I.} you've been hearing a lot recently are S.D.I. S.D.I. stands for

our Strategic Defense Initiative, the high-tech ^{defender} ~~umbrella~~ we are ^{investigating} ~~developing~~ to protect America against ^{and its allies} ~~nuclear~~ ^{ballistic-missile} attack. [When I met with General Secretary Gorbachev in Geneva in 1985 and in Reykjavik, Iceland last year, he exerted every bit of pressure he could to try to make us give up S.D.I. Well, I, of course, had to disappoint him each time. Building a defense against nuclear weapons is a moral as well as strategic imperative, and we will

Mention the signing!

All wrong!

Have to mention START

Not "umbrella;" it overstates the capability

Optional cut

never give it up. Our bottom line on S.D.I. is simple: We will research it, we will test it, and, when it is ready, we will deploy it.]

Well, in a way we have made progress in this area too.

~~Mr. Gorbachev has dropped his insistence on halting S.D.I. In~~
fact, Mr. Gorbachev has admitted in his television interview that the Soviets are ^{researching} ~~building~~ their own S.D.I. system -- we call it the Red Shield. Said Secretary Gorbachev: "We are doing

everything you are doing." I might amend that statement slightly to "everything and more," for while we are still in the research

and testing stage, the Soviets ^{already have a modernized anti-ballistic missile} ~~have already begun to deploy their~~
~~defense system deployed around Moscow.~~
~~Red Shield system.~~

The fact is, and I'm afraid most of us in this country aren't fully aware of this fact, the United States presently has no defense against ^{ballistic} ~~nuclear~~ missiles. No defense at all. If even one was launched against an American city, ^{by any country, we could suffer} ~~the President could do~~
~~nothing but stand by and watch~~ the tragic destruction of millions of American lives. This is an intolerable situation. We will move forward with S.D.I. -- it is our moral duty.

Now, I don't want you to think that this summit was taken up exclusively with arms reduction ~~talks~~. I talked extensively with Mr. Gorbachev about our insistence that his policy of ^{"openness"} ~~"glasnost"~~ become more than a slogan, that we begin to see real progress on

human rights. As I ^{told him} ~~emphasized to Mr. Gorbachev~~, nothing would convince us of ^{his} ~~the~~ sincerity of "glasnost" ^{more than seeing real} ~~so much as allowing~~
~~progress in emigration, release of political prisoners, an end of harassment of~~
~~his people their most basic right to worship their Maker in~~
~~religious practice, and other steps,~~
~~peace, free of harassment.~~

Finally, we talked directly about Afghanistan and other potential regional crises, including the Middle East and the Iran-Iraq war. We stressed the need to set a date certain -- next year -- for their total withdrawal from Afghanistan, to talk to the freedom fighters, and to allow self-determination for the Afghan people. We stressed the urgency of action, not more discussion, in the United Nations Security Council to bring Iran to end its aggression. The Soviet response so far is not sufficient, but the message we conveyed was clear.

So, we have a long road to travel. But we've taken important steps.

With your help, we'll make that journey.

(Gilder/ARD)
December 9, 1987
6:30 p.m.

PRESIDENTIAL RADIO TALK: SUMMIT
SATURDAY, DECEMBER 12, 1987

My fellow Americans:

Dec 7-10 As you know, we had an important visitor in Washington this week. General Secretary Gorbachev was in town for only 7 days, but, though our time was short, we accomplished much.

Now, with all the reports of I.N.F.'s, I.C.B.M.'s, and S.D.I. you've been hearing the last few days, I wouldn't be surprised if some people were a little bit confused by all those letters. We call it the alphabet soup. So let me just begin by trying to put all this into English that everybody can understand.

I.N.F. stands for Intermediate Nuclear Forces. They are shorter-range nuclear-capable missiles installed in the Soviet Union and Europe. When the Soviets first started deploying these missiles in the 1970's, they represented a totally new nuclear threat to Europe and Japan for which we had no comparable deterrent.

In response, despite intense pressure, political pressure, exerted by the Soviet Union on Europe, NATO began implementation of its "two-track" policy. We would deploy our own I.N.F. and, at the same time, push hard in negotiations to do away with this new and unprecedented nuclear escalation.

In 1981, I first proposed what would come to be called the "zero option." It called for the complete elimination of these I.N.F. on both sides. The reaction to this proposal was mixed,

US and Soviet

to say the least. ~~The Soviets~~ ^{Some} called it a mere propaganda ploy, and many in the media in this country agreed.

But we were patient and persistent, and the result is that, for the first time in history, arms control has been replaced by arms reduction. Actually, I should say arms elimination, because with this treaty, an entire class of I.N.F. ~~missiles~~ ^{missiles} -- both U.S. and Soviet -- will be destroyed. Now, the Soviets presently have many more of these missiles than we do, so they'll be destroying some 1,600 ~~missiles~~ ^{deployed warheads}, while we destroy ~~400 warheads~~ ^{about 400}.

When this treaty takes effect, the world will be witness to a remarkable sight. ~~This agreement is not based on trust. We insisted on being able to verify that the Soviets actually destroy their INF missiles and that they don't build any new ones. Therefore this treaty has the most stringent verification in the history of arms control, including several forms of on-site inspection and even a provision for a team of resident inspectors in each other's country.~~ ^{This agreement is not based on trust. We insisted on being able to verify that the Soviets actually destroy their INF missiles and that they don't build any new ones. Therefore this treaty has the most stringent verification in the history of arms control, including several forms of on-site inspection and even a provision for a team of resident inspectors in each other's country.} ~~Simultaneously, the Soviets will begin launching their missiles eastward, where they will burn out and fall harmlessly into the wastes of Siberia.~~

So ~~hopefully~~ in the near future, I.N.F. will be one part of the alphabet soup you won't have to remember. The other letters you've been hearing a lot recently are S.D.I. S.D.I. stands for our Strategic Defense Initiative, the high-tech ~~umbrella~~ ^{defense} we are ~~developing~~ ^{working on} to protect America ~~against nuclear attack~~ ^{and our allies} ~~ballistic missiles~~. When I met with General Secretary Gorbachev in Geneva in 1985 and in Reykjavik, Iceland last year, he exerted every bit of pressure he could to try to make us give up S.D.I. Well, I, of course, had to disappoint him each time. Building a defense against nuclear weapons is a moral as well as strategic imperative, and we will

never give it up. Our bottom line on S.D.I. is simple: We will research it, we will test it, and, when it is ready, we will deploy it.

Well, in a way we have made progress in this area too.

not so.
~~Mr. Gorbachev has dropped his insistence on halting S.D.I.~~ In

for by
safer
fact, Mr. Gorbachev has admitted in his television interview that

researching
the Soviets are building their own S.D.I. system -- we call it

the Red Shield. [Said Secretary Gorbachev:] *"Practically, the Soviet Union*

all that the United States is
everything you are doing." I might amend that statement slightly

don't quote
to "everything and more," for while we are still in the research

WI
12/30/87
AI
and testing stage, the Soviets have already ~~begin~~ *ed* to deploy their

world's only anti-ballistic missile
Red Shield system, which protects Moscow.

The fact is, and I'm afraid most of us in this country

aren't fully aware of this fact, the United States presently has

no defense against *Ballistic* nuclear missiles. No defense at all. If even

one was launched against an American city, *by any country, we could*

suffer
~~nothing but stand by and watch~~ the tragic destruction of millions

of American lives. This is an intolerable situation. We will

move forward with S.D.I. -- it is our moral duty.

Now, I don't want you to think that this summit was taken up

exclusively with arms reduction talks. I talked extensively with

Mr. Gorbachev about our insistence that his policy of "glasnost"

become more than a slogan, that we begin to see *much more* real progress on

human rights. As I emphasized to Mr. Gorbachev, nothing would

convince us of the sincerity of "glasnost" so much as allowing

his people their most basic right to worship their Maker in

peace, free of harassment.

Finally, we talked directly about the situation in Afghanistan (Afghanistan insert here).

TR

WHITE HOUSE STAFFING MEMORANDUM

DATE: 12/09/87

ACTION/CONCURRENCE/COMMENT DUE BY: 2:00 p.m. Thursday 12/10

SUBJECT: PRESIDENTIAL RADIO TALK: SUMMIT

(12/09 6:30 p.m. draft)

	ACTION FYI			ACTION FYI	
VICE PRESIDENT	☐	☒	FITZWATER	☐	☒
BAKER	☐	☒	GRISCOM	☒	☐
DUBERSTEIN	☐	☒	HOBBS	☐	☐
MILLER - OMB	☐	☐	HOOLEY	☐	☒
BALL	☒	☐	KING	☐	☐
BAUER	☐	☐	RANGE	☒	☐
[REDACTED] POWELL	☒	☐	RISQUE	☒	☐
CRIBB	☐	☐	RYAN	☐	☐
CRIPPEN	☐	☐	SPRINKEL	☐	☐
CULVAHOUSE <i>none</i>	☒	☐	TUTTLE	☐	☐
DAWSON	☐	☒	DOLAN	☐	☒
DONATELLI	☐	☐		☐	☐

REMARKS:

Please provide any comments/recommendations to Tony Dolan by 2:00 p.m. on Thursday, December 10th, with an info copy to my office. Thanks.

RESPONSE:

see Comments / JD

(Gilder/ARD)
December 9, 1987
6:30 p.m.

PRESIDENTIAL RADIO TALK: SUMMIT
SATURDAY, DECEMBER 12, 1987

My fellow Americans:

As you know, we had an important visitor in Washington this week. General Secretary Gorbachev was in town for only 3 days, but, though our time was short, we accomplished much.

Now, with all the reports of I.N.F.'s, I.C.B.M.'s, and S.D.I. you've been hearing the last few days, I wouldn't be surprised if some people were a little bit confused by all those letters. We call it the alphabet soup. So let me just begin by trying to put all this into English that everybody can understand.

I.N.F. stands for Intermediate Nuclear Forces. They are shorter-range nuclear-capable missiles installed in the Soviet Union and Europe. When the Soviets first started deploying these missiles in the 1970's, they represented a totally new nuclear threat to Europe and Japan for which we had no comparable deterrent.

In response, despite intense pressure, political pressure, exerted by the Soviet Union on Europe, NATO began implementation of its "two-track" policy. We would deploy our own I.N.F.'s and, at the same time, push hard in negotiations to do away with this new and unprecedented nuclear escalation.

In 1981, I first proposed what would come to be called the "zero option." It called for the complete elimination of these I.N.F.'s on both sides. The reaction to this proposal was mixed,

to say the least. The Soviets called it a mere propaganda ploy, and many in the media in this country agreed.

But we were patient and persistent, and the result is that, for the first time in history, arms control has been replaced by arms reduction. Actually, I should say arms elimination, because with this treaty, an entire class of I.N.F.'s -- both U.S. and Soviet -- will be destroyed. Now, the Soviets presently have many more of these missiles than we do, so they'll be destroying some 1,600 missiles, while we destroy 400.

When this treaty takes effect, the world will be witness to a remarkable sight. You see, each side must verify that the other has actually destroyed its missiles.

So, after we remove the warheads, we will start firing off our I.N.F. missiles from the West Coast of Europe into the Atlantic Ocean.

Simultaneously, the Soviets will begin launching their missiles eastward, where they will burn out and fall harmlessly into the wastes of Siberia.

That is why we insisted on a comprehensive verification regime including on-site inspections.

So hopefully in the near future, I.N.F. will be one part of the alphabet soup you won't have to remember. The other letters you've been hearing a lot recently are S.D.I. S.D.I. stands for our Strategic Defense Initiative, the high-tech umbrella we are developing to ~~protect America against nuclear attack~~ *as a protective shield* *offensive missile*. When I met with General Secretary Gorbachev in Geneva in 1985 and in Reykjavik, Iceland last year, he exerted every bit of pressure he could to try to make us give up S.D.I. Well, I, of course, had to disappoint him each time. Building a defense against nuclear weapons is a moral as well as strategic imperative, and we will

never give it up. Our bottom line on S.D.I. is simple: We will research it, we will test it, and, when it is ready, we will deploy it.

Well, in a way we have made ^{some} progress in this area too.

Mr. Gorbachev has dropped his insistence on halting S.D.I. In ~~fact, Mr. Gorbachev has admitted in his television interview that~~ *However, they have persisted in efforts to limit the vital* ~~fact, Mr. Gorbachev has admitted in his television interview that~~ *testing in this area. But providing a strategic* ~~the Soviets are building their own S.D.I. system -- we call it~~ *the Red Shield. Said Secretary Gorbachev: "We are doing just* ~~the Red Shield. Said Secretary Gorbachev: "We are doing just~~ *promise it holds for the future generation. Defense, not offense. I might amend that statement slightly* ~~everything you are doing." I might amend that statement slightly~~ *as the That is what S.O.I. holds* ~~to "everything and more," for while we are still in the research~~ *to "everything and more," for while we are still in the research* ~~and testing stage, the Soviets have already begun to deploy their~~ *and testing stage, the Soviets have already begun to deploy their* ~~Red Shield system.~~

The fact is, and I'm afraid most of us in this country aren't fully aware of this fact, the United States presently has ~~to rely on a policy in which our nations hold each other hostage to nuclear~~ *terror and destruction.* ~~no defense against nuclear missiles. No defense at all. If even~~ ~~one was launched against an American city, the President could do~~ ~~nothing but stand by and watch the tragic destruction of millions~~ ~~of American lives.~~ This is an intolerable situation. We will move forward with S.D.I. -- it is our moral duty.

Now, I don't want you to think that this summit was taken up exclusively with arms reduction talks. I talked extensively with Mr. Gorbachev about our insistence that his policy of "glasnost" become more than a slogan, that we begin to see real progress on human rights. As I emphasized to Mr. Gorbachev, nothing would convince us of the sincerity of "glasnost" so much as allowing his people their most basic right to worship their Maker in peace, free of harassment.

Finally, we talked directly about the situation in
Afghanistan (Afghanistan insert here).