Collection: Speechwriting, White House Office of: Research Office, 1981-1989

Folder Title: 05/27/1988 Address on East-West Relations, Finlandia Hall, Helsinki, Finland (Clark/Barbara) (3)

Box: 383

put in title

(Judge)
May 9, 1988
5:00 p.m.

The House of Democracy

PRESIDENTIAL ADDRESS: ADDRESS ON EAST-WEST RELATIONS
FINLANDIA HALL
HELSINKI, FINLAND
WEDNESDAY MAY 25, 1988

1988 MAY -9

Mr. President, Mr. Prime Minister, Ladies and Gentlemen:

It is a particular honor for me to come here today. This year -- the "Year of Friendship," as Congress has proclaimed it, between the United States and Finland -- this year marks the 350th anniversary of the arrival of the first Finns in America and the establishment of a small Scandinavian colony near what is today Wilmington, Delaware. An ancient people in a new world -- that is the story, not only of those Finns, but of all the peoples who braved the seas, to settle in and build my country, a land of freedom for a nation of immigrants.

Yes, they founded a new world, but as they crossed the oceans, the mountains, and the prairies, those who made America carried the old world in their hearts -- the old customs, the family ties, and most of all, the belief in God, a belief that gave them the moral compass and ethical foundation by which they explored an uncharted frontier and constructed a government and nation of, by, and for the people.

We are gathered today in this hall because it was here, almost 13 years ago, that the 35 nations of the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe signed a document that embodies ~~the same ethical and moral principals that so many European immigrants gave America~~, the Helsinki Final Act. —

many of the same values which Europeans and Americans contrive to share to the present day.

Insert For Page 2 of Text

Much has been said about the Helsinki Final Act since that first day of August 1975 when it was signed. It is a long document and a complex one. There is diasagreement on how to interpret some of its provisions. In the so-called "three baskets" of the document, there are measures touching upon almost every aspect of East-West relations: military relations, economic and environmental issues, humanitarian cooperation, and ways of facilitating the free movement of people, ideas, and information between East and West. Indeed, the ambitious range of the Final Act's provisions is what makes this document so valuable and unique. The authors of this agreement recognized that genuine improvement of security in Europe requires a new spirit of openness and cooperation across what was once called the Iron Curtain, a spirit which would allow the wounds of a divided Europe to heal and all the peoples of this great continent to live and work freely with one another.

The spirit of the Final Act thus reflects a fundamental truth, a truth that gathers strength...(continue with speech)

replace with insert

~~Much has been said about the Helsinki agreement and its shortcomings, and the violations of it in the Eastern bloc. And yet, despite all the bleak winds that have swept the plains of justice since that signing day in 1975, the Accords have taken root in the conscience of humanity and grown in moral and, increasingly, in diplomatic authority. And I believe that this is, as those with whom I will meet in just 48 hours might say, "no accident." For the Accords reflect a fundamental truth, a~~ truth that gathers strength with each passing season, and that will not be denied -- the truth that, like the first Finnish settlers in America, all our ~~ancient~~ peoples find themselves today in a new world, ~~and that, as those early settlers discovered, the greatest creative and moral force in this new world,~~ in which the greatest hope for survival and success, for peace and happiness, is human freedom.

Yes, freedom -- the right to speak, to print, to assemble, to travel, the right to worship and believe, the right to be different, the right, as the American poet, Henry David Thoreau, wrote, "to march to a different drummer." This is freedom as most Europeans and Americans understand it and freedom as it is embodied in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and, yes, in the Helsinki Accords. And -- far more than the locomotive or the automobile, the airplane or the rocket, more than radio, television or the computer -- this concept of liberty is the most distinct, peculiar, and powerful invention of the civilization we all share.

Indeed, let us admit candidly that without this freedom there would have been no mechanical inventions, for inventions are eccentricities. The men and women who create them are visionaries, just like artists and writers. They see what others fail to see and trust their insights when others don't. The same freedom that permits literature and the arts to flourish, the same freedom that allows one to attend a church, a synagogue, or a mosque without apprehension, that same freedom from oppression and supervision is the freedom that has given us -- the peoples of Western Europe and North America -- our dynamism, our economic growth, and our industrial strength. Together with Japan, Australia and others we have lived in this state of freedom, this House of Democracy, since the end of the Second World War. Because of that, because of the liberty and popular rule we have shared, today we also share a prosperity more widely distributed and extensive, a political order more tolerant and humane than has ever before been known on earth.

To see not simply the immediate but the historic importance of this, we should remember how far so many of our nations have traveled -- and how bleak the future of freedom and democracy once seemed. There is a story that illustrates what I'm saying. It was shortly after the Second World War, and George Orwell recalled saying once to Arthur Koestler that "History stopped in 1936" at which Koestler "nodded in immediate understanding." Orwell added that "we were both thinking of totalitarianism."

For decades, the totalitarian temptation, in one form or another, has beckoned to mankind, also promising freedom -- but ~~another~~ of a different kind ~~of freedom~~ than the one we celebrate ~~here~~ today. This totalitarian concept of liberty is, as the Czechoslovak~~ian~~ writer Milan Kundera has put it, "the age old dream of a world where everybody would live in harmony, united by a single common will and faith, without secrets from one another" -- the freedom of imposed perfection.

In the last 7 decades, in pursuit of this so-called freedom, millions of voices have been silenced in dozens of countries. ~~Printing presses have been smashed and books burned. Houses of worship have been padlocked and gutted or burned into museums of atheism. Forced labor camps have been built and populated. Psychiatric hospitals have been transformed into torture chambers. Labor movements have been crushed.~~

Equate Soviets with Nazis? Dangerous

Fifty, forty, even as recently as thirty years ago, the contest between totalitarian freedom on one hand and democratic freedom on the other seemed a close one. The totalitarian promises of utopia lured many Western thinkers and millions of others besides. And many believed in the confident prediction, of history's inevitable triumph.

Few are so swayed today. Just as democratic freedom has proven itself incredibly fertile -- fertile not merely in a material sense, but also in the abundance it has brought forth in the human spirit -- so too totalitarian freedom has proven barren. It has failed to produce comfort. It has failed to

produce spiritual satisfaction. It has even failed to produce the equality that was its most ~~enduring~~ alluring promise.

Albert Camus once predicted that, in his words, "When revolution in the name of power and of history becomes a murderous and immoderate mechanism, a new rebellion is consecrated in the name of moderation and of life." Isn't this exactly what we see happening across ~~the~~ Europe~~an plains and even to the Urals~~ today? In Western Europe, support for totalitarian ideologies -- including support among intellectuals -- has all but collapsed, while in the non-democratic countries, leaders grapple with the internal contradictions of their system and some ~~ask how they can~~ search for ways to make that system better and more productive?

In a sense, the front in the war of ideas that has been raging in Europe and America for more than 70 years has moved East. Once it was the democracies that doubted their own view of freedom and wondered whether the totalitarian system might not be better. Today, the doubt is on the other side.

In just two days, I will meet in Moscow with General Secretary Gorbachev. It will be our fourth set of face to face talks in two years. The General Secretary has spoken often and forthrightly of the problems he sees in the Soviet Union. In his campaign to correct these problems, he talks of "glasnost" and "perestroika" -- openness and restructuring, words that to our ears have a particularly welcome sound. And since he began his campaign, things have happened that we -- all of us in the House of Democracy -- applaud.

The list includes the release ~~of~~ from labor camps or exile of people like Andrei Sakharov, Irina Ratushinskaya, Anatoliy Koryagin, Josif Begun, ~~Mustafa Dzhemilev~~, and ~~other~~ many prisoners of conscience; the publication of books like Dr. Zhivago and the distribution of movies critical of aspects of the Soviet past and present, movies like ~~Resurrection~~ Repentance; the allowing of greater emigration; the toleration of greater dissent; General Secretary Gorbachev's recent promise to grant a measure of religious freedom; his commitment to withdraw from Afghanistan.

All this is new and good. But at the same time, there is another list. Items on it include that the Soviet Union [~~was the sole dissenter~~ continues to obstruct] ~~to~~ agreement on human rights issues in the Vienna follow-up meeting to the Helsinki talks; that there remain systematic Soviet human rights violations under the Helsinki Final Act; that the Baltic nations and most of the Eastern European nations also have significant human rights problems; that in Asia, Africa, and Central America the Soviets continue to support regimes that are fighting against their own people or their neighbors.

This second list will be at the top of my agenda in the days ahead. What I shall say will include that it is time for the Soviet Union to live up fully to the ~~standards of~~ commitments it made in the Helsinki Final Act. Thirteen years after the Final Act was signed, it is difficult to understand why cases of divided families and blocked marriages should remain on the East-West agenda; or why Soviet citizens who wish to exercise their right to emigrate should be subject to artificial quotas and arbitrary rulings. And what are we to think of the continued suppression of those who wish to

practice their religious beliefs. We see no reason why the Soviet Union cannot release all prisoners of conscience.

Our goal is a safer world and a brighter future for all people. Arms agreements alone will not make the world safer. We must also reduce the reasons for having arms in the first place. That's why -- together with arms reductions, regional conflicts, and people to people exchanges -- human rights is so high on not only the U.S.-Soviet but the East-West agenda. at the highest levels

The Soviets and their allies agreed here, at Helsinki, to respect the human rights of their citizens and to subscribe to the Universal Declaration of Human Rights. ~~[That was an international agreement, as are arms reduction agreements and force reduction agreements.]~~ This It created international obligations for the Soviets and the ~~nations~~ governments of Eastern Europe. ~~as do arms reduction and force reduction agreements. How can we trust that the Soviets and the Eastern European countries will respect future agreements if they do not respect current ones?~~

Wrong. HFA not a legal treaty like INF.

the Governments / Union / fulfill

Mr. Gorbachev talks about a "common European home." But what is it that unifies the nations of Western Europe today -- and also, I believe, unifies the peoples, though not the regimes, of Eastern Europe? What is it but the Judeo-Christian tradition and its teachings about the inalienable rights and dignity of all ~~God's children~~ men and women? What is it but a common commitment to pluralistic democracy? What but a common dedication to the democratic concept of liberty, ? ~~not anti-totalitarianism~~? All of these -- all of these -- mark the common European home. And yet the Soviet Union ~~has never~~ still refuses to accepted any of these.

Mr. Gorbachev has spoken of, in his words, "the artificiality and temporariness of the bloc-to-bloc confrontation and the archaic nature of the 'iron curtain.'" This is my concern, too. I would welcome a sign that the Soviets and their allies are ready to ~~embrace the values that not only unify~~ abide fully by the commitments of the Helsinki Final Act which seek to overcome the ~~but define contemporary Western European civilization and its grateful child, American civilization.~~ postwar division of Europe by increasing free contact and communication between the peoples of East and West.

confusing

~~Europe and Asia form one continuous land mass. If there is indeed a "House of Europe," then more than geography must distinguish it.~~ The true "House of Europe" is and must be the "House of Democracy." Is the Soviet leadership ready to draw aside the iron curtain? Are they ready to ~~let~~ give freedom ~~ring~~ a chance throughout Eastern Europe and their own country?

No need to attack Lenin on eve of Moscow.

~~Or when they speak of "democratization" do they still mean "democracy" in the sense that Lenin meant it when he said: "Soviet socialist democracy is not in the least incompatible with... dictatorship." He continued, "What is necessary is.... recognition of the dictorial powers of one man." And he concluded, "All phrases about equal rights are nonsense."~~

I hope and pray that not only in the talks ahead but, in the years ahead, the Soviets and their allies will begin to move toward ~~our~~ a true concept of democracy and freedom, ~~if only because they want their economies to keep pace with that of Europe, Japan, and America~~. Ending human rights violations is just the first step towards laying the foundation both for lasting friendship with the democracies and for economic growth. If human rights live by the whim of a country's rulers, they won't

be treated as rights, only as gifts -- gifts that might be taken away by a whim, as well. This has been the sad fate of the Russian and Soviet peoples for centuries, as they passed from one leader to another.

During the late 19^50's, when the Soviet Union was going through another period of relative openness, the ~~left-wing~~ Italian socialist Pietro Nenni, who was a friend of the Soviet Union, warned that it was wrong to think that the relaxation could be permanent in, as he said, "the absence of any system of judicial guarantees." And he added that, again in his words, "only the complete restoration of democracy and liberty" could prevent a return to despotism.

This is exactly the challenge today. In the past year, I have suggested a number of steps, in addition to clearing the human rights ~~calendar~~ agenda, that the Soviet leadership can take if ~~they~~ its members wish to demonstrate that glasnost truly means openness. I've said they can tear down the Berlin Wall and all barriers between Eastern and Western Europe. They can join with us in making Berlin itself an all-European center of communications, meetings, and travel. They and the regimes of Eastern Europe can end all internal as well as external restrictions on travel.

They can also give legal and practical protection to free expression and worship. ~~Let me interject here that at one time Moscow was known as the "City of the Forty Forties," because there were more than 1,000 bells in the churches of the city. Today there are few functioning churches and no bells. What a magnificent demonstration of goodwill it would be for the Soviet~~

Too much focus on single issue of religion.

~~leadership to stop the harassment of worshipers, to allow the churches to reopen, and for church bells to be heard again not only in Moscow but throughout the Soviet Union?~~

But beyond these particular steps, the Soviets and their allies should also ask a deeper question. How can they make not simply their decrees but their institutions protect rights. There is, of course, a simple and profound starting place. As the French constitutional philosopher Montesquieu wrote more than two centuries ago, "There is no liberty, if the power of judging be not separated" from the other powers of government. The complete independence of the judiciary is essential to the guarantee of human rights.

So, too, is popular control over those who draft the laws. Secret ballots and the freedom to form political parties and run candidates -- these are among the elements of a system in which human rights enjoy institutional protection.

I know all this is a tall order, and some may say an unrealistic one. But is it realistic to pretend that rights are truly protected when there are no effective safeguards against arbitrary rule? And is it realistic to say that peace is truly secure in the care of such a political structure. After all it was no less an observer than Friedrich Engels who wrote of another autocratic regime more than a century-and-a-half ago that, as he put it, "As soon as Russia has... internal party struggles [and] a constitutional rc (?) form under which these party struggles may be fought without violent convulsions... the traditional Russian policy of conquest is a thing of the past."

What I am suggesting is, at its heart, that the leaders of the Soviet Union and Eastern Europe take seriously, to the very marrow of their bones, the commitments their countries made in this room 13 years ago. They pledged to honor what was for them a new concept of openness and liberty. Looking at their countries today, who would doubt that all would be better off if that pledge were to be fulfilled?

And yet, until they have accomplished this great transformation, we in the West must remain strong, prepared, and vigilant. We saw in the events leading up to agreement on the Intermediate Nuclear Forces Treaty that, in the world as it is today, peace truly does depend on Western strength and unity. We must heed this lesson.

But we must also be prepared to work with the Soviets and their allies whenever they are ready to step forward and work with us. That is what I will be doing in the days ahead. I believe that in Moscow, Mr. Gorbachev and I can take another step toward a brighter future and a safer world. And I believe that, for the sake of all our ~~ancient~~ peoples, this new world must be a ~~place both of democratic freedom and of peace~~ House of Democracy in order to become a world of peace. It must be a world in which the spirit of the Helsinki Final Act guides ~~all~~ East and West ~~mankind~~ like a great beacon of hope into the ages to come.

Thank you and God bless you.

Highlight theme

Document No. 561337

WHITE HOUSE STAFFING MEMORANDUM

DATE: 05/09/88 **ACTION/CONCURRENCE/COMMENT DUE BY:** C.O.B. Tuesday, 05/10/88

SUBJECT: PRESIDENTIAL ADDRESS: ADDRESS ON EAST-WEST RELATIONS
HELSINKI, FINLAND
(05/09 5:00 p.m. draft)

	ACTION	FYI		ACTION	FYI
VICE PRESIDENT	☐	☑	HOBBS	☐	☐
BAKER	☐	☑	HOOLEY	☐	☑
DUBERSTEIN	☐	☑	KRANOWITZ	☑	☐
MILLER - OMB	☐	☐	POWELL	☑	☐
BAUER	☐	☐	RANGE	☑	☐
CRIBB	☐	☐	RISQUE	☐	☐
CRIPPEN	☐	☐	RYAN	☐	☐
CULVAHOUSE	☑	☐	SPRINKEL	☐	☐
DAWSON	☐P	☑S	TUTTLE	☐	☐
DONATELLI	☐	☐	DOLAN	☐	☑
FITZWATER	☐	☑	COURTEMANCHE	☐	☑
GRISCOM	☑	☐	_____	☐	☐

REMARKS: Please provide any comments/recommendations directly to Tony Dolan by close of business on Tuesday, May 10th, with an info copy to my office. Thanks.

RESPONSE:

See attached comments

Rhett Dawson
Ext. 2702

(Judge)
May 9, 1988
5:00 p.m.

PRESIDENTIAL ADDRESS: ADDRESS ON EAST-WEST RELATIONS
FINLANDIA HALL
HELSINKI, FINLAND
WEDNESDAY MAY 25, 1988

Mr. President, Mr. Prime Minister, Ladies and Gentlemen:

It is a particular honor for me to come here today. This year -- the "Year of Friendship," as Congress has proclaimed it, between the United States and Finland -- this year marks the 350th anniversary of the arrival of the first Finns in America and the establishment of a small Scandinavian colony near what is today Wilmington, Delaware. An ancient people in a new world -- that is the story, not only of those Finns, but of all the peoples who braved the seas, to settle in and build my country, a land of freedom for a nation of immigrants.

Yes, they founded a new world, but as they crossed the oceans, the mountains, and the prairies, those who made America carried the old world in their hearts -- the old customs, the family ties, and most of all, the belief in God, a belief that gave them the moral compass and ethical foundation by which they explored an uncharted frontier and constructed a government and nation of, by, and for the people.

We are gathered today in this hall because it was here, almost 13 years ago, that the 35 nations of the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe signed a document that embodies the same ethical and moral principals that so many European immigrants gave America, the Helsinki Final Act.

Much has been said about the Helsinki agreement and its shortcomings, and the violations of it in the Eastern bloc. And yet, despite all the bleak winds that have swept the plains of justice since that signing day in 1985, the Accords have taken root in the conscience of humanity and grown in moral and, increasingly, in diplomatic authority. And I believe that this is, as those with whom I will meet in just 48 hours might say, "no accident." For the Accords reflect a fundamental truth, a truth that gathers strength with each passing season, and that will not be denied -- the truth that, like the first Finnish settlers in America, all our ancient peoples find themselves today in a new world, and that, as those early settlers discovered, the greatest creative and moral force in this new world, the greatest hope for survival and success, for peace and happiness, is human freedom.

Yes, freedom -- the right to speak, to print, to assemble, to travel, the right to worship and believe, the right to be different, the right, as the American poet, Henry David Thoreau, wrote, "to march to a different drummer." This is freedom as most Europeans and Americans understand it and freedom as it is embodied in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and, yes, in the Helsinki Accords. And -- far more than the locomotive or the automobile, the airplane or the rocket, more than radio, television or the computer -- this concept of liberty is the most distinct, peculiar, and powerful invention of the civilization we all share.

Indeed, let us admit candidly that without this freedom there would have been no mechanical inventions, for inventions are eccentricities. The men and women who create them are visionaries, just like artists and writers. They see what others fail to see and trust their insights when others don't. The same freedom that permits literature and the arts to flourish, the same freedom that allows one to attend church, synagogue, or mosque without apprehension, that same freedom from oppression and supervision is the freedom that has given us -- the peoples of Western Europe and America -- our dynamism, our economic growth, and our industrial strength. Together with Japan, we have lived in this state of freedom, this House of Democracy since the end of the Second World War. Because of that, because of the liberty and popular rule we have shared, today we also share a prosperity more widely distributed and extensive, a political order more tolerant and humane than has ever before been known on earth.

To see not simply the immediate but the historic importance of this, we should remember how far so many of our nation's have traveled -- and how bleak the future of freedom and democracy once seemed. There is a story that illustrates what I'm saying. It was shortly after the Second World War, and George Orwell recalled saying once to Arthur Koestler that "History stopped in 1936" at which Koestler "nodded in immediate understanding." Orwell added that "we were both thinking of totalitarianism."

For decades, the totalitarian temptation, in one form or another, has beckoned to mankind, also promising freedom -- but another kind of freedom than the one we celebrate here today. This totalitarian concept of liberty is, as the Czechoslovakian writer Milan Kundera has put it, "the age old dream of a world where everybody would live in harmony, united by a single common will and faith, without secrets from one another" -- the freedom of imposed perfection.

In the last 7 decades, in pursuit of this so-called freedom, millions of voices have been silenced in dozens of countries. Printing presses have been smashed and books burned. Houses of worship have been padlocked and gutted or turned into museums of atheism. Forced labor camps have been built and populated. Psychiatric hospitals have been transformed into torture chambers. Labor movements have been crushed.

Fifty, forty, even as recently as thirty years ago, the contest between totalitarian freedom on one hand and democratic freedom on the other seemed a close one. The totalitarian promises of utopia lured many Western thinkers and millions of others besides. And many believed in the confident prediction, of history's inevitable triumph.

Few are so swayed today. Just as democratic freedom has proven itself incredibly fertile -- fertile not merely in a material sense, but also in the abundance it has brought forth in the human spirit -- so too totalitarian freedom has proven barren. It has failed to produce comfort. It has failed to

produce spiritual satisfaction. It has even failed to produce the equality that was its most enduring promise.

Albert Camus once predicted that, in his words, "When revolution in the name of power and of history becomes a murderous and immoderate mechanism, a new rebellion is consecrated in the name of moderation and of life." Isn't this exactly what we see happening across the European plains and even to the Urals today? In Western Europe, support for totalitarian ideologies -- including support among intellectuals -- has all but collapsed, while in the non-democratic countries, leaders grapple with the internal contradictions of their system and some ask how they can make that system better and more productive?

In a sense, the front in the war of ideas that has been raging in Europe and America for more than 70 years has moved East. Once it was the democracies that doubted their own view of freedom and wondered whether the totalitarian system might not be better. Today, the doubt is on the other side.

In just two days, I will meet in Moscow with General Secretary Gorbachev. It will be our fourth set of face to face talks in two years. The General Secretary has spoken often and forthrightly of the problems he sees in the Soviet Union. In his campaign to correct these problems, he talks of "glasnost" and "peristroika" -- openness and restructuring, words that to our ears have a particularly welcome sound. And since he began his campaign, things have happened that we -- all of us in the House of Democracy -- applaud.

The list includes the release of Andrei Sakharov, Irina Ratushinska, Anatoliy Koryagin, Josif Begun, Mustafa Dzhemilev, and other prisoners of conscience; the publication of books like Dr. Zhivago and the distribution of movies critical of aspects of the Soviet past and present, movies like Resurrection; the allowing of greater emigration; the toleration of greater dissent; General Secretary Gorbachev's recent promise to grant a measure of religious freedom; his commitment to withdraw from Afghanistan.

All this is new and good. But at the same time, there is another list. Items on it include that the Soviet Union was the sole dissenter to agreement on human rights issues in the Vienna follow-up to the Helsinki talks; that there remain Soviet human rights violations under the Helsinki Final Act; that the Baltic nations and most of the Eastern European nations also have significant human rights problems; that in Asia, Africa, and Central America the Soviets continue to support regimes that are fighting against their own people or their neighbors.

This second list will be at the top of my agenda in the days ahead. What I shall say will include that it is time for the Soviet Union to live up fully to the standards of the Helsinki Final Act. Thirteen years after the Final Act was signed, it is difficult to understand why cases of divided families and blocked marriages should remain on the East-West agenda; or why Soviet citizens who wish to exercise their right to emigrate should be subject to artificial quotas and arbitrary rulings. And what are we to think of the continued suppression of those who wish to

practice their religious beliefs. We see no reason why the Soviet Union cannot release all prisoners of conscience.

Our goal is a safer world and a brighter future for all people. Arms agreements alone will not make the world safer. We must also reduce the reasons for having arms in the first place. That's why -- together with arms reductions, regional conflicts, and people to people exchanges -- human rights is so high on not only the U.S.-Soviet but the East-West agenda.

The Soviets and their allies agreed here, at Helsinki, to respect the human rights of their citizens and to subscribe to the Universal Declaration of Human Rights. That was an international agreement, as are arms reduction agreements and force reduction agreements. It created international obligations for the Soviets and the nations of Eastern Europe, as do arms reduction and force reduction agreements. How can we trust that the Soviets and the Eastern European countries will respect future agreements if they do not respect current ones?

Mr. Gorbachev talks about a "common European home." But what is it that unifies the nations of Western Europe today -- and also, I believe, unifies the peoples, though not the regimes, of Eastern Europe? What is it but the Judeo-Christian tradition and its teachings about the inalienable rights and dignity of all God's children? What is it but a common commitment to pluralistic democracy? What but a common dedication to the democratic concept of liberty, not the totalitarian one? All of these -- all of these -- mark the common European home. And yet the Soviet Union has never accepted any of these.

Mr. Gorbachev has spoken of, in his words, "the artificiality and temporariness of the bloc-to-bloc confrontation and the archaic nature of the 'iron curtain.'" This is my concern, too. I would welcome a sign that the Soviets and their allies are ready to embrace the values that not only unify but define contemporary Western European civilization and its grateful child, American civilization.

Europe and Asia form one continuous land mass. If there is indeed a "House of Europe," then more than geography must distinguish it. The true "House of Europe" is and must be the "House of Democracy." Is the Soviet leadership ready to draw aside the iron curtain? Are they ready to let freedom ring throughout Eastern Europe and their own country?

Or when they speak of "democratization" do they still mean "democracy" in the sense that Lenin meant it when he said: "Soviet socialist democracy is not in the least incompatible with... dictatorship." He continued, "What is necessary is.... recognition of the dictorial powers of one man." And he concluded, "All phrases about equal rights are nonsense."

I hope and pray that not only in the talks ahead but, in the years ahead, the Soviets and their allies will begin to move toward our concept of democracy and freedom -- if only because they want their economies to keep pace with that of Europe, Japan, and America. Ending human rights violations is just the first step towards laying the foundation both for lasting friendship with the democracies and for economic growth. If human rights live by the whim of a country's rulers, they won't

be treated as rights, only as gifts -- gifts that might be taken away by a whim, as well. This has been the sad fate of the Russian and Soviet peoples for centuries, as they passed from one leader to another.

During the late 50's, when the Soviet Union was going through another period of relative openness, the left-wing Italian socialist Pietro Nenni, who was a friend of the Soviet Union, warned that it was wrong to think that the relaxation could be permanent in, as he said, "the absence of any system of judicial guarantees." And he added that, again in his words, "only the complete restoration of democracy and liberty" could prevent a return to despotism.

This is exactly the challenge today. In the past year, I have suggested a number of steps, in addition to clearing the human rights calendar, that the Soviet leadership can take if they wish to demonstrate that glasnost truly means openness. I've said they can tear down the Berlin Wall and all barriers between Eastern and Western Europe. They can join with us in making Berlin itself an all-European center of communications, meetings, and travel. They and the regimes of Eastern Europe can end all internal as well as external restrictions on travel.

They can also give legal and practical protection to free expression and worship. Let me interject here that at one time Moscow was known as the "City of the Forty Forties," because there were more than 1,600 bells in the churches of the city. Today there are few functioning churches and no bells. What a magnificent demonstration of goodwill it would be for the Soviet

leadership to stop the harassment of worshipers, to allow the churches to reopen, and for church bells to be heard again not only in Moscow but throughout the Soviet Union?

But beyond these particular steps, the Soviets and their allies should also ask a deeper question. How can they make not simply their decrees but their institutions protect rights. There is, of course, a simple and profound starting place. As the French constitutional philosopher Montesquieu wrote more than two centuries ago, "There is no liberty, if the power of judging be not separated" from the other powers of government. The complete independence of the judiciary is essential to the guarantee of human rights.

So, too, is popular control over those who draft the laws. Secret ballots and the freedom to form political parties and run candidates -- these are among the elements of a system in which human rights enjoy institutional protection.

I know all this is a tall order, and some may say an unrealistic one. But is it realistic to pretend that rights are truly protected when there are no effective safeguards against arbitrary rule? And is it realistic to say that peace is truly secure in the care of such a political structure. After all it was no less an observer than Friedrich Engels who wrote of another autocratic regime more than a century-and-a-half ago that, as he put it, "As soon as Russia has... internal party struggles [and] a constitutional form under which these party struggles may be fought without violent convulsions... the traditional Russian policy of conquest is a thing of the past."

What I am suggesting is, at its heart, that the leaders of the Soviet Union and Eastern Europe take seriously, to the very marrow of their bones, the commitment their countries made in this room 13 years ago. They pledged to honor what was for them a new concept of liberty. Looking at their countries today, who would doubt that all would be better off if that pledge were to be fulfilled?

And yet, until they have accomplished this great transformation, we in the West must remain strong, prepared, and vigilant. We saw in the events leading up to agreement on the Intermediate Nuclear Forces Treaty that, in the world as it is today, peace truly does depend on Western strength. We must heed this lesson.

But we must also be prepared to work with the Soviets and their allies whenever they are ready to step forward and work with us. That is what I will be doing in the days ahead. I believe that in Moscow, Mr. Gorbachev and I can take another step toward a brighter future and a safer world. And I believe that, for the sake of all our ancient peoples, this new world must be a place both of democratic freedom and of peace. It must be a world in which the spirit of the Helsinki Final Act guides all mankind like a great beacon of hope into the ages to come.

Thank you and God bless you.

THE WHITE HOUSE

WASHINGTON

May 10, 1988

MEMORANDUM FOR REBECCA RANGE

FROM: MAX GREEN

SUBJECT: Comments on Presidential Address re: East-West Relations, Helsinki, Finland

Page 3:

The first sentence is simply wrong in saying that without freedom "there would have been no mechanical inventions...."

Page 4:

Phrase "freedom of imposed perfection" will be misinterpreted or pass over everyone's heads.

Paragraph three should specify crimes of Stalin and Hitler.

Paragraph 4 standing by itself seems to imply that totalitarianism and mass murder would be OK if they produced good crops.

Page 5:

A reference to Solzenhitzen and the impact of his revelations might be more apt. At least refer to Camus' debates with Stalinists like Sartre.

Page 6:

The second full paragraph is very weak; the fact is that the totalitarianism structure remains intact.

Pages 6-8:

Some of the paragraphs here are yawners; this needs shortening.

Page 8:

Surely we can come up with some more blood curdling quotes from Lenin. Also, mention that Gorbachev bases himself on Lenin.

Document No. 561337

Barbara

WHITE HOUSE STAFFING MEMORANDUM

DATE: 05/09/88 **ACTION/CONCURRENCE/COMMENT DUE BY:** C.O.B. Tuesday, 05/10/88

SUBJECT: PRESIDENTIAL ADDRESS: ADDRESS ON EAST-WEST RELATIONS
HELSINKI, FINLAND
(05/09 5:00 p.m. draft)

	ACTION	FYI		ACTION	FYI
VICE PRESIDENT	☐	☑	HOBBS	☐	☐
BAKER	☐	☑	HOOLEY	☐	☑
DUBERSTEIN	☐	☑	KRANOWITZ	☐	☐
MILLER - OMB	☐	☐	POWELL	☑	☐
BAUER	☐	☐	RANGE	☑	☐
CRIBB	☐	☐	RISQUE	☐	☐
CRIPPEN	☐	☐	RYAN	☐	☐
CULVAHOUSE	☑	☐	SPRINKEL	☐	☐
DAWSON	☐P	☑S	TUTTLE	☐	☐
DONATELLI	☐	☐	DOLAN	☐	☑
FITZWATER	☐	☑	COURTEMANCHE	☐	☑
GRISCOM	☑	☐	_____	☐	☐

REMARKS: Please provide any comments/recommendations directly to Tony Dolan by close of business on Tuesday, May 10th, with an info copy to my office. Thanks.

RESPONSE:

Legis. Aff.: Concur without changes.
(Note: reference on page 11 to INF Treaty may need to be changed, depending upon outcome in U.S.-Soviet discussions and Administration-Senate discussions in coming weeks.)

Rhett Dawson
Ext. 2702

10 May

What I am suggesting is, at its heart, that the leaders of the Soviet Union and Eastern Europe take seriously, to the very marrow of their bones, the commitment their countries made in this room 13 years ago. They pledged to honor what was for them a new concept of liberty. Looking at their countries today, who would doubt that all would be better off if that pledge were to be fulfilled?

And yet, until they have accomplished this great transformation, we in the West must remain strong, prepared, and vigilant. We saw in the events leading up to agreement on the Intermediate Nuclear Forces Treaty that, in the world as it is today, peace truly does depend on Western strength. We must heed this lesson.

But we must also be prepared to work with the Soviets and their allies whenever they are ready to step forward and work with us. That is what I will be doing in the days ahead. I believe that in Moscow, Mr. Gorbachev and I can take another step toward a brighter future and a safer world. And I believe that, for the sake of all our ancient peoples, this new world must be a place both of democratic freedom and of peace. It must be a world in which the spirit of the Helsinki Final Act guides all mankind like a great beacon of hope into the ages to come.

Thank you and God bless you.

THE WHITE HOUSE

WASHINGTON

May 10, 1988

MEMORANDUM FOR ANTHONY R. DOLAN
DEPUTY ASSISTANT TO THE PRESIDENT AND
DIRECTOR OF SPEECHWRITING

FROM: ARTHUR B. CULVAHOUSE, JR.
COUNSEL TO THE PRESIDENT

SUBJECT: Presidential Address: Address on East-West Relations -- Helsinki, Finland

Counsel's office has reviewed the above-referenced Presidential remarks, and we have no legal objection to their delivery. We have, however, marked several editorial changes on the attached copy for your consideration.

Thank you for submitting these remarks for our review.

Attachment

cc: Rhett B. Dawson

(Judge)
May 9, 1988
5:00 p.m.

PRESIDENTIAL ADDRESS: ADDRESS ON EAST-WEST RELATIONS
FINLANDIA HALL
HELSINKI, FINLAND
WEDNESDAY MAY 25, 1988

1988 MAY -9 P 5:5

Mr. President, Mr. Prime Minister, Ladies and Gentlemen:

It is a particular honor for me to come here today. This year -- the "Year of Friendship," as Congress has proclaimed it, between the United States and Finland -- this year marks the 350th anniversary of the arrival of the first Finns in America and the establishment of a small Scandinavian colony near what is today Wilmington, Delaware. An ancient people in a new world -- that is the story, not only of those Finns, but of all the peoples who braved the seas, to settle in and build my country, a land of freedom for a nation of immigrants.

Yes, they founded a new world, but as they crossed the oceans, the mountains, and the prairies, those who made America carried the old world in their hearts -- the old customs, the family ties, and most of all, the belief in God, a belief that gave them the moral compass and ethical foundation by which they explored an uncharted frontier and constructed a government and nation of, by, and for the people.

We are gathered today in this hall because it was here, almost 13 years ago, that the 35 nations of the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe signed a document that embodies the same ethical and moral principals that so many European immigrants gave America, the Helsinki Final Act.

Much has been said about the Helsinki agreement and its shortcomings, and the violations of it in the Eastern bloc. And yet, despite all the bleak winds that have swept the plains of justice since that signing day in 1975, the Accords have taken root in the conscience of humanity and grown in moral and, increasingly, in ~~diplomatic~~ legal authority. And I believe that this is, as those with whom I will meet in just 48 hours might say, "no accident." For the Accords reflect a fundamental truth, a truth that gathers strength with each passing season, and that will not be denied -- the truth that, like the first Finnish settlers in America, all our ~~ancient~~ peoples find themselves today in a new world, and that, as those early settlers discovered, the greatest creative and moral force in this new world, the greatest hope for survival and success, for peace and happiness, is human freedom.

Yes, freedom -- the right to speak, to print, to assemble, to travel, the right to worship and believe, the right to be different, the right, as the American poet, Henry David Thoreau, wrote, "to march to a different drummer." This is freedom as most Europeans and Americans understand it and freedom as it is embodied in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and, yes, in the Helsinki Accords. And -- far more than the locomotive or the automobile, the airplane or the rocket, more than radio, television or the computer -- this concept of liberty is the most distinct, peculiar, and powerful invention of the civilization we all share.

Indeed, let us admit candidly that without this freedom there would have been no mechanical inventions, for inventions are eccentricities. The men and women who create them are visionaries, just like artists and writers. They see what others fail to see and trust their insights when others don't. ~~The~~ same freedom that permits literature and the arts to flourish, the same freedom that allows one to attend church, synagogue, or mosque without apprehension, that same freedom from oppression and supervision is the freedom that has given us -- the peoples of Western Europe and America -- our dynamism, our economic growth, and our industrial strength. Together with Japan, we have lived in this state of freedom, this House of Democracy since the end of the Second World War. Because of that, because of the liberty and popular rule we have shared, today we also share a prosperity more widely distributed and extensive, a political order more tolerant and humane than has ever before been known on earth.

This is the

To see not simply the immediate but the historic importance of this, we should remember how far so many of our nation's have traveled -- and how bleak the future of freedom and democracy once seemed. There is a story that illustrates what I'm saying. It was shortly after the Second World War, and George Orwell recalled saying once to Arthur Koestler that "History stopped in 1936" at which Koestler "nodded in immediate understanding." Orwell added that "we were both thinking of totalitarianism."

For decades, the totalitarian temptation, in one form or another, has beckoned to mankind, also promising freedom -- but another kind of freedom than the one we celebrate here today. This totalitarian concept of liberty is, as the Czechoslovakian writer Milan Kundera has put it, "the age old dream of a world where everybody would live in harmony, united by a single common will and faith, without secrets from one another" -- the freedom of imposed perfection.

In the last 7 decades, in pursuit of this so-called freedom, millions of voices have been silenced in dozens of countries. Printing presses have been smashed and books burned. Houses of worship have been padlocked and gutted or turned into museums of atheism. Forced labor camps have been built and populated. Psychiatric hospitals have been transformed into torture chambers. Labor movements have been crushed.

Fifty, forty, even as recently as thirty years ago, the contest between totalitarian freedom on one hand and democratic freedom on the other seemed a close one. The totalitarian promises of utopia lured many Western thinkers and millions of others besides. And many believed in the confident prediction, of history's inevitable triumph.

Few are so swayed today. Just as democratic freedom has proven itself incredibly fertile -- fertile not merely in a material sense, but also in the abundance it has brought forth in the human spirit -- so too totalitarian freedom has proven barren. It has failed to produce comfort. It has failed to

produce spiritual satisfaction. It has even failed to produce the equality that was its most ~~enduring~~ persistent promise.

Albert Camus once predicted that, in his words, "When revolution in the name of power and of history becomes a murderous and immoderate mechanism, a new rebellion is consecrated in the name of moderation and of life." Isn't this exactly what we see happening across the European plains and even to the Urals today? In Western Europe, support for totalitarian ideologies -- including support among intellectuals -- has all but collapsed, while in the non-democratic countries, leaders grapple with the internal contradictions of their system and some ask how they can make that system better and more productive?

In a sense, the front in the war of ideas that has been raging in Europe and America for more than 70 years has moved East. Once it was the democracies that doubted their own view of freedom and wondered whether the totalitarian system might not be better. Today, the doubt is on the other side.

In just two days, I will meet in Moscow with General Secretary Gorbachev. It will be our fourth set of face to face talks in ~~two~~ less than three years. The General Secretary has spoken often and forthrightly of the problems he sees in the Soviet Union. In his campaign to correct these problems, he talks of "glasnost" and "peristroika" -- openness and restructuring, words that to our ears have a particularly welcome sound. And since he began his campaign, things have happened that we -- all of us in the House of Democracy -- applaud.

The list includes the release of Andrei Sakharov, Irina Ratushinska, Anatoliy Koryagin, Josif Begun, Mustafa Dzhemilev, and other prisoners of conscience; the publication of books like Dr. Zhivago and the distribution of movies critical of aspects of the Soviet past and present, movies like Resurrection; the allowing of greater emigration; the toleration of greater dissent; General Secretary Gorbachev's recent promise to grant a measure of religious freedom; his commitment to withdraw from Afghanistan.

All this is new and good. But at the same time, there is another list. Items on it include that the Soviet Union was the sole dissenter to agreement on human rights issues in the Vienna follow-up to the Helsinki talks; that there remain Soviet human rights violations under the Helsinki Final Act; that the Baltic nations and most of the Eastern European nations also have significant human rights problems; that in Asia, Africa, and Central America the Soviets continue to support regimes that are fighting against their own people or their neighbors.

This second list will be at the top of my agenda in the days ahead. What I shall say will include that it is time for the Soviet Union to live up fully to the standards of the Helsinki Final Act. Thirteen years after the Final Act was signed, it is difficult to understand why cases of divided families and blocked marriages should remain on the East-West agenda; or why people in the Soviet Union, ~~citizens~~ who wish to exercise their right to emigrate, should be subject to artificial quotas and arbitrary rulings. And what are we to think of the continued suppression of those who wish to

practice their religious beliefs. We see no reason why the Soviet Union cannot release all prisoners of conscience.

Our goal is a safer world and a brighter future for all people. Arms agreements alone will not make the world safer. We must also reduce the reasons for having arms in the first place. That's why -- together with arms reductions, regional conflicts, and people to people exchanges -- human rights is so high on not only the U.S.-Soviet but the East-West agenda.

The Soviets Union and ~~their~~ its allies agreed here, at Helsinki, to respect the human rights of their citizens and to subscribe to the Universal Declaration of Human Rights. That was an international agreement, as are arms reduction agreements and force reduction agreements. It created international obligations for the Soviets Union and the nations of Eastern Europe, as do arms reduction and force reduction agreements. How can we trust that the Soviets and the Eastern European countries will respect future agreements if they do not respect current ones?

Mr. Gorbachev talks about a "common European home." But what is it that unifies the nations of Western Europe today -- and also, I believe, unifies the peoples, though not the regimes, of Eastern Europe? What is it but the Judeo-Christian tradition and its teachings about the inalienable rights and dignity of all God's children? What is it but a common commitment to pluralistic democracy? What but a common dedication to the democratic concept of liberty, not the totalitarian one? All of these -- all of these -- mark the common European home. And yet the Soviet Union has never accepted any of these.

Mr. Gorbachev has spoken of, in his words, "the artificiality and temporariness of the bloc-to-bloc confrontation and the archaic nature of the 'iron curtain.'" This is my concern, too. I would welcome a sign that the Soviet Union and its ~~their~~ allies are ready to embrace the values that not only unify but define contemporary Western European civilization and its grateful child, American civilization.

Europe and Asia form one continuous land mass. If there is indeed a "House of Europe," then more than geography must distinguish it. The true "House of Europe" is and must be the "House of Democracy." Is the Soviet leadership ready to draw aside the iron curtain? Are they ready to let freedom ring throughout Eastern Europe and their own country?

Or when they speak of "democratization" do they still mean "democracy" in the sense that Lenin meant it when he said: "Soviet socialist democracy is not in the least incompatible with... dictatorship." He continued, "What is necessary is.... recognition of the dictorial powers of one man." And he concluded, "All phrases about equal rights are nonsense."

I hope and pray that not only in the talks ahead but, in the years ahead, the Soviet Union and its ~~their~~ allies will begin to move toward our concept of democracy and freedom -- if only because they want their economies to keep pace with that of Europe, Japan, and America. Ending human rights violations is just the first step towards laying the foundation both for lasting friendship with the democracies and for economic growth. If human rights live by the whim of a country's rulers, they won't

be treated as rights, only as gifts -- gifts that might be taken away by a whim, as well. This has been the sad fate of the Russian ~~and Soviet~~ peoples for centuries, as they passed from one leader to another.

During the late 50's, when the Soviet Union was going through another period of relative openness, the left-wing Italian socialist Pietro Nenni, who was a friend of the Soviet Union, warned that it was wrong to think that the relaxation could be permanent in, as he said, "the absence of any system of judicial guarantees." And he added that, again in his words, "only the complete restoration of democracy and liberty" could prevent a return to despotism.

This is exactly the challenge today. In the past year, I have suggested a number of steps, in addition to clearing the human rights calendar, that the Soviet leadership can take if they wish to demonstrate that glasnost truly means openness. I've said they can tear down the Berlin Wall and all barriers between Eastern and Western Europe. They can join with us in making Berlin itself an all-European center of communications, meetings, and travel. They and the regimes of Eastern Europe can end all internal as well as external restrictions on travel.

They can also give legal and practical protection to free expression and worship. Let me interject here that at one time Moscow was known as the "City of the Forty Forties," because there were more than 1,600 bells in the churches of the city. Today there are few functioning churches and no bells. What a magnificent demonstration of goodwill it would be for the Soviet

Union's leadership to stop the harassment of worshipers, to allow the churches to reopen, and for church bells to be heard again not only in Moscow but throughout the Soviet Union?

But beyond these particular steps, the Soviets Union and ~~their~~ its allies should also ask a deeper question. How can they make not simply their decrees but their institutions protect human rights. There is, of course, a simple and profound starting place. As the French constitutional philosopher Montesquieu wrote more than two centuries ago, "There is no liberty, if the power of judging be not separated" from the other powers of government. The complete independence of the judiciary is essential to the guarantee of human rights.

So, too, is popular control over those who draft the laws. Secret ballots and the freedom to form political parties and run candidates -- these are among the elements of a system in which human rights enjoy institutional protection.

I know all this is a tall order, and some may say an unrealistic one. But is it realistic to pretend that rights are truly protected when there are no effective safeguards against arbitrary rule? And is it realistic to say that peace is truly secure in the care of such a political structure. After all it was no less an observer than Friedrich Engels who wrote of another autocratic regime more than a century-and-a-half ago that, as he put it, "As soon as Russia has... internal party struggles [and] a constitutional form under which these party struggles may be fought without violent convulsions... the traditional Russian policy of conquest is a thing of the past."

What I am suggesting is, at its heart, that the leaders of the Soviet Union and Eastern Europe take seriously, to the very marrow of their bones, the commitment their countries made in this room 13 years ago. They pledged to honor what was for them a new concept of liberty. Looking at their countries today, who would doubt that all would be better off if that pledge were to be fulfilled?

And yet, until they have accomplished this great transformation, we in the West must remain strong, prepared, and vigilant. We saw in the events leading up to agreement on the Intermediate Nuclear Forces Treaty that, in the world as it is today, peace truly does depend on Western strength. We must heed this lesson.

But we must also be prepared to work with the Soviet Union and its ~~their~~ allies whenever they are ready to step forward and work with us. That is what I will be doing in the days ahead. I believe that in Moscow, Mr. Gorbachev and I can take another step toward a brighter future and a safer world. And I believe that, for the sake of all our ancient peoples, this new world must be a place both of democratic freedom and of peace. It must be a world in which the spirit of the Helsinki Final Act guides all mankind like a great beacon of hope into the ages to come.

Thank you and God bless you.

FYI

THE WHITE HOUSE
WASHINGTON

TO: TONY DOLAN

FROM JAMES L. HOOLEY
Deputy Assistant to the President
Director of Presidential Advance

☐ Information

☐ Action

PLEASE NOTE RICK AHEARN'S SPEECH COMMENTS (AND MY EDITS TO HIS COMMENTS). HE IS IN MOSCOW, SO DID NOT RECEIVE THEM IN TIME TO MEET DEADLINE. NEVERTHELESS, THEY ARE IMPORTANT TO NOTE.

cc: GRISCOM/DAWSON

THE WHITE HOUSE

WASHINGTON

(Dictated but not read via phone)

May 16, 1988

MEMORANDUM FOR JAMES L. HOOLEY

FROM: FREDERICK L. AHEARN

SUBJECT: MOSCOW STATE UNIVERSITY SPEECH

Just a few brief notes on the proposed Moscow State University speech text. There are a few points that should be called to your attention so corrections can be made on what are, in several instances, glaring errors.

1. On page 1, it is still to be confirmed that the speech will be broadcast live in the Soviet Union as mentioned in line 2, paragraph 3. *I do not believe that we have confirmation — JH*

2. Also on page 1 next to the bottom line, I thought this was our 4th summit, not the 3rd summit. *— correct (4th, that is) — JH*

3. Page 5 last line of the next to the last paragraph, may I suggest we insert students in place of kids.

4. Finally, page 13 the 3rd line of the next to the last paragraph, we are meeting in Moscow in May and June, not April 1988.

5. In the Helsinki speech, page 9 the last 2 lines make reference to few functioning churches and no bells. When the President visits Danilov Monastery, he will find the bells to be deafening in their sound as we all noticed on the pre-advance, so we may want to change this to say almost no bells.

Doesn't Josh remember our eardrums being split when we walked into the monastery grounds on the pre-advance?!

(Judge)
May 24, 1988
10:30 a.m.

PRESIDENTIAL ADDRESS: ADDRESS ON EAST-WEST RELATIONS
FINLANDIA HALL
HELSINKI, FINLAND
FRIDAY MAY 27, 1988

Mr. President, Mr. Prime Minister, Ladies and Gentlemen:

Let me begin by saying thank you to our hosts, the Finnish Government, the Paaskivi Society, and the League of Finnish-American Societies.

It is a particular honor for me to come here today. This year -- the "Year of Friendship," as Congress has proclaimed it, between the United States and Finland -- this year marks the 350th anniversary of the arrival of the first Finns in America and the establishment of a small Scandinavian colony near what is today Wilmington, Delaware. An ancient people in a new world -- that is the story, not only of those Finns, but of all the peoples who braved the seas, to settle in and build my country, a land of freedom for a nation of immigrants.

Yes, they founded a new world, but as they crossed the oceans, the mountains, and the prairies, those who made America carried the old world in their hearts -- the old customs, the family ties, and, most of all, the belief in God, a belief that gave them the moral compass and ethical foundation by which they explored an uncharted frontier and constructed a government and nation of, by, and for the people.

And so, although we Americans became a new people, we also remain an ancient one, for we are guided by ancient and universal values -- values that Prime Minister Holkeri [HOL-care-ee] spoke

of in Los Angeles this February when, after recalling Finland's internationally recognized position of neutrality, he added that Finland is "tied to Western values of freedom, democracy, and human rights."

And let me add here that for America, those ties are also the bonds of our friendship. America respects Finland's neutrality. We support Finland's independence. We honor Finland's courageous history. We salute the creative statesmanship that has been Finland's gift to world peace. And in this soaring hall -- which is the great architect Alvar Aalto's statement of hope for Finland's future -- we reaffirm our hope and faith that the friendship between our nations will be unending.

We are gathered here today in this hall because it was here, almost 13 years ago, that the 35 nations of the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe signed the Helsinki Final Act -- a document that embodies the same ethical and moral principles and the same hope for a future of peace that Finns and so many other European immigrants gave America. The Final Act is a singular statement of hope. Its "three baskets" touch on almost every aspect of East-West relations, and taken together form a kind of map through the wilderness of mutual hostility to open fields of peace and to a common home of trust among all of our sovereign nations -- neutrals, non-aligned, and alliance members alike. The Final Act set new standards of conduct for our nations and provided the mechanisms by which to apply those standards.

Yes, the Final Act goes beyond arms control -- once the focus of international dialogue. It reflects a truth that I have so often noted -- nations do not distrust each other because they are armed; they are armed because they distrust each other. The Final Act grapples with the full range of our underlying differences and deals with East-West relations as an interrelated whole. It reflects the belief of all our countries that human rights are less likely to be abused when a nation's security is less in doubt; that economic relations can contribute to security, but depend on the trust and confidence that come from increasing ties between our peoples, increasing openness, and increasing freedom; and that there is no true international security without respect for human rights.

And beyond establishing these integrated standards, the Final Act establishes a process for progress. It sets up a review procedure to measure performance against standards. And -- despite the doubts of the critics -- for the past 13 years, the signatory states have mustered the political will to keep on working and making progress.

Let me say that it seems particularly appropriate to me that the Final Act is associated so closely with this city and this country. More than any other diplomatic document, the Final Act speaks to the yearning that Finland's longtime President, Urho [ER-ho] Kekkonen [KECK-oh-nen], spoke of more than a quarter century ago, when he said, in his words, "It is the fervent hope of the Finnish people that barriers be lowered all over Europe and that progress be made along the road of European unity." And

he added that this was, as he put it, "for the good of Europe, and thus of humanity as a whole." Those were visionary words. That vision inspired and shaped the drafting of the Final Act and continues to guide us today.

Has the Final Act and what we call the Helsinki process worked or not? Many say it hasn't, but I believe it has.

In the security field, I would point to the most recent fruit of the process -- the Stockholm Document on confidence- and security-building measures in Europe. This agreement lays down the rules by which our 35 states notify each other of upcoming military activities in Europe; provides detailed information on these activities in advance; lets the others know their plans for very large military activities one to two years in advance and agrees not to hold such maneuvers unless this notice is given; invites observers to their larger military activities; and permits on-site inspections to make sure the agreement is honored.

I am happy to note that since our representatives shook hands to seal this agreement a year and a half ago, all 35 states have, by and large, honored both the letter and the spirit of the Stockholm Document. The Western and neutral and non-aligned states have set a strong example in providing full information about their military activities. In April, Finland held its first military activity subject to the Stockholm notification requirements and voluntarily invited observers to it. The Soviet Union and its allies also have a generally good record of implementation, though less forthcoming than the West. Ten

on-site inspections have been conducted so far, and more and more states are exercising their right to make such inspections. I can't help but believe that making inspections a matter of routine business will improve openness and enhance confidence.

Nor was Stockholm the end of the process. In Vienna, all 35 signatory states are considering how to strengthen the confidence- and security-building measures, in the context of a balanced outcome at the C.S.C.E. Follow-Up Meeting that includes significant progress on human rights.

In the economic field, as in the security field, I believe there has been progress, but of a different kind. Issues and negotiations regarding security are not simple, but military technology makes arms and armies resemble each other enough so that common measures can be confidently applied. Economic relations, by contrast, are bedeviled by differences in our systems. Perhaps increases in non-strategic trade can contribute to better relations between East and West, but it is difficult to relate the state-run economies of the East to the essentially free-market economies of the West. Perhaps some of the changes underway in the state-run economies will equip them better to deal with our businessmen, and open new arenas for cooperation. But our work on these issues over the years has already made us understand that differences in systems are serious obstacles to expansion of economic ties, and since understanding of unpleasant realities is part of wisdom, that too, is progress.

The changes taking place in the Eastern countries of the continent go beyond changes in their economic systems and greater

openness in their military activities: changes have also begun to occur in the field of human rights, as was called for in the Final Act. The rest of us would like to see the changes that are being announced actually registered in the law and practice of our Eastern partners, and in the documents under negotiation in the Vienna follow-up to the Helsinki Conference.

Much has been said about the human rights and humanitarian provisions in the Final Act and the failure of the Eastern bloc to honor them. Yet, for all the bleak winds that have swept the plains of justice since that signing day in 1975, the Accords have taken root in the conscience of humanity and grown in moral and, increasingly, in diplomatic authority. I believe that this is no accident. It reflects an increasing realization that the agenda of East-West relations must be comprehensive -- that security and human rights must be advanced together, or cannot truly be secured at all. But it also shows that the provisions in the Final Act reflect standards that are truly universal in their scope. The Accords embody a fundamental truth, a truth that gathers strength with each passing season, and that will not be denied -- the truth that, like the first Finnish settlers in America, all our ancient peoples find themselves today in a new world, and that, as those early settlers discovered, the greatest creative and moral force in this new world, the greatest hope for survival and success, for peace and happiness, is human freedom.

Yes, freedom -- the right to speak, to print, to assemble, to travel, the right to worship and believe, the right to be different, the right, as the American philosopher, Henry David

Thoreau, wrote, "to step to the music [of]... a different drummer." This is freedom as most Europeans and Americans understand it and freedom as it is embodied in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and, yes, in the Helsinki Accords. And -- far more than the locomotive or the automobile, the airplane or the rocket, more than radio, television or the computer -- this concept of liberty is the most distinct, peculiar, and powerful invention of the civilization we all share.

Indeed, without this freedom there would have been no mechanical inventions, for inventions are eccentricities. The men and women who create them are visionaries, just like artists and writers. They see what others fail to see and trust their insights when others don't. The same freedom that permits literature and the arts to flourish, the same freedom that allows one to attend church, synagogue, or mosque without apprehension, that same freedom from oppression and supervision is the freedom that has given us -- the peoples of Western Europe and North America -- our dynamism, our economic growth, and our inventiveness. Together with Japan, Australia, and many others, we have lived in this state of freedom, this House of Democracy since the end of the Second World War. The House of Democracy is a House whose doors are open to all. Because of it, because of the liberty and popular rule we have shared, today we also share a prosperity more widely distributed and extensive, a political order more tolerant and humane than has ever before been known on earth.

To see not simply the immediate but the historic importance of this, we should remember how far so many of our nations have traveled -- and how desolate the future of freedom and democracy once seemed. There is a story that illustrates what I'm saying. It was shortly after the Second World War, and George Orwell recalled saying to Arthur Koestler that "History stopped in 1936," to which Koestler "nodded in immediate understanding." Orwell added that "we were both thinking of totalitarianism."

For much of this century, the totalitarian temptation, in one form or another, has beckoned to mankind, also promising freedom -- but of a different kind than the one we celebrate today. This concept of liberty is, as the Czechoslovak writer Milan [Mu-LAHN] Kundera [Kun-DARE-ah] has put it, "the age-old dream of a world where everybody would live in harmony, united by a single common will and faith, without secrets from one another" -- the freedom of imposed perfection.

Fifty, forty, even as recently as thirty years ago, the contest between this utopian concept of freedom on one hand and the democratic concept of freedom on the other seemed a close one. Promises of a perfect world lured many Western thinkers and millions of others besides. And many believed in the confident prediction of history's inevitable triumph.

Few do today. Just as democratic freedom has proven itself incredibly fertile -- fertile not merely in a material sense, but also in the abundance it has brought forth in the human spirit -- so too utopianism has proven brutal and barren.

Albert Camus once predicted that, in his words, "when revolution in the name of power and of history becomes a murderous and immoderate mechanism, a new rebellion is consecrated in the name of moderation and of life." Isn't this exactly what we see happening across the mountains and plains of Europe and even beyond the Urals today? In Western Europe, support for utopian ideologies -- including support among intellectuals -- has all but collapsed, while in the non-democratic countries, leaders grapple with the internal contradictions of their system and some ask how they can make that system better and more productive.

In a sense, the frontline in the competition of ideas that has played in Europe and America for more than 70 years has shifted East. Once it was the democracies that doubted their own view of freedom and wondered whether utopian systems might not be better. Today, the doubt is on the other side.

In just two days, I will meet in Moscow with General Secretary Gorbachev. It will be our fourth set of face-to-face talks since 1985. The General Secretary and I have developed a broad agenda for U.S.-Soviet relations -- an agenda linked directly to the agenda of the Final Act.

Yes, as does the Final Act, we will discuss security issues. We will pursue progress in arms reduction negotiations across the board and continue our exchanges on regional issues.

Yes, we will also discuss economic issues, although, as in the Helsinki process, we have seen in recent years how much differences in our systems inhibit expanded ties, and how

difficult it is to divorce economic relations from human rights and other elements of the relationship.

And, yes, as our countries did at Helsinki, we will take up other bilateral areas, as well -- including scientific, cultural and people-to-people exchanges, where we have been hard at work identifying new ways to cooperate. In this area, in particular, I believe we'll see some good results before the week is over.

And like the Final Act, our agenda now includes human rights as an integral component. We have developed our dialogue, and put in place new mechanisms for discussion. The General Secretary has spoken often and forthrightly of the problems confronting the Soviet Union. In his campaign to address these shortcomings, he talks of "glasnost" and "perestroika" -- openness and restructuring, words that to our ears have a particularly welcome sound. And since he began his campaign, things have happened that all of us applaud.

The list includes the release from labor camps or exile of people like Andrei Sakharov, Irina Ratushinskaya, Anatoly Koryagin, Josef Begun, and many other prisoners of conscience; the publication of books like Dr. Zhivago and Children of the Arbat; the distribution of movies like Repentance, that are critical of aspects of the Soviet past and present; allowing higher levels of emigration; greater toleration of dissent; General Secretary Gorbachev's recent statements on religious toleration; the beginning of Soviet withdrawal from Afghanistan.

All this is new and good. But at the same time, there is another list, defined not by us but by the standard of the

Helsinki Final Act and the sovereign choice of all participants, including the Soviet Union, to subscribe to it. We need look no farther through the Final Act to see where Soviet practice does not -- or does not yet -- measure up to Soviet commitment.

Thirteen years after the Final Act was signed, it is difficult to understand why cases of divided families and blocked marriages should remain on the East-West agenda; or why Soviet citizens who wish to exercise their right to emigrate should be subject to artificial quotas and arbitrary rulings. And what are we to think of the continued suppression of those who wish to practice their religious beliefs? Over three hundred men and women whom the world sees as political prisoners have been released. There remains no reason why the Soviet Union cannot release <u>all</u> people still in jail for expression of political or religious belief, or for organizing to monitor the Helsinki Act.

The Soviets talk about a "common European home," and define it largely in terms of geography. But what is it that cements the structure of clear purpose that all our nations pledged themselves to build by their signature of the Final Act? What is it but the belief in the inalienable rights and dignity of every single human being? What is it but a commitment to true pluralist democracy? What is it but a dedication to the universally understood democratic concept of liberty that evolved from the genius of European civilization? This body of values -- this is what marks, or should mark, the common European home.

Mr. Gorbachev has spoken of, in his words, "the artificiality and temporariness of the bloc-to-bloc confrontation

and the archaic nature of the 'iron curtain.'" I join him in this belief, and welcome every sign that the Soviets and their allies are ready, not only to embrace, but to put into practice the values that unify, and, indeed, define contemporary Western European civilization and its grateful American offspring.

Some 30 years ago, during another period of relative openness, the Italian socialist, Pietro Nenni, long a friend of the Soviet Union, warned that it was wrong to think that the relaxation could be permanent in, as he said, "the absence of any system of judicial guarantees." And he added that only democracy and liberty could prevent reversal of the progress underway.

There are a number of steps, which, if taken, would help ensure the deepening and institutionalization of promising reforms. First, the Soviet leaders could agree to tear down the Berlin Wall and all barriers between Eastern and Western Europe. They could join us in making Berlin itself an all-European center of communications, meetings, and travel.

They could also give legal and practical protection to free expression and worship. Let me interject here that at one time Moscow was known as the City of the Forty Forties, because there were 1,600 belfries in the churches of the city. The world welcomes the return of some churches to worship after many years. But there are still relatively few functioning churches, and almost no bells. Mr. Gorbachev recently said, as he put it, "believers are Soviet people, workers, patriots, and they have the full right to express their conviction with dignity." I applaud Mr. Gorbachev's statement. What a magnificent

demonstration of goodwill it would be for the Soviet leadership for church bells to ring out again not only in Moscow but throughout the Soviet Union.

But beyond these particular steps, there is a deeper question. How can the countries of the East not only grant but guarantee the protection of rights?

The thought and practice of centuries has pointed the way. As the French constitutional philosopher, Montesquieu, wrote more than 200 years ago, "there is no liberty, if the judiciary power be not separated" from the other powers of government. And, like the complete independence of the judiciary, popular control over those who make the laws provides a vital, practical guarantee of human rights. So does the secret ballot. So does the freedom of citizens to associate and act for political purposes or for free collective bargaining.

I know that for the Eastern countries such steps are difficult, and some may say it is unrealistic to call for them. Some said, in 1975, that the standards set forth in the Final Act were unrealistic; that the comprehensive agenda it embodied was unrealistic. Some said, earlier in this decade, that calling for global elimination of an entire class of U.S. and Soviet intermediate-range nuclear missiles was unrealistic; that calling for 50 percent reductions in U.S. and Soviet strategic offensive arms was unrealistic; that the Soviets would never withdraw from Afghanistan. Is it realistic to pretend that rights are truly protected when there are no effective safeguards against arbitrary rule? Is it realistic, when the Soviet leadership

But we are also prepared to work with the Soviets and their allies whenever they are ready to work with us. By strength we do not mean diktat, that is, an imposed settlement; we mean confident negotiation. The road ahead may be long -- but not so long as our countries had before them 44 years ago when Finland's great President, J.K. Paasikivi [PAH-ska-vee],told a nation that had shown the world uncommon courage in a harrowing time: "A path rises up the slope from the floor of the valley. At times the ascent is gradual, at other times steeper. But all the time one comes closer and closer to free, open spaces, above which God's ever brighter sky can be seen. The way up will be difficult.... But every step will take us closer to open vistas."

I believe that in Moscow, Mr. Gorbachev and I can take another step toward a brighter future and a safer world. And I believe that, for the sake of all our ancient peoples, this new world must be a place both of democratic freedom and of peace. It must be a world in which the spirit of the Helsinki Final Act guides all our countries like a great beacon of hope to all mankind for ages to come.

Thank you, God bless you, and bear with me now, Onnea ja memestysta koko suomen kansalle. [ohn-nee-uh yah MEN-es-tuss-ta coco SWO-men cahn-sell-la] (This means: "Happiness and success to all the people of Finland.")

itself is calling for glasnost and democratization, to say that judicial guarantees, or the independence of the judiciary, or popular control over those that draft the laws, or freedom to associate for political purposes, are unrealistic? And, finally, is it realistic to say that peace is truly secure when political systems are less than open?

We believe that realism is on our side when we say that peace and freedom can only be achieved together, ~~but that they can indeed be achieved together if we are prepared to drive toward that goal~~. So did the leaders who met in this room to sign the Final Act. They were visionaries of the most practical kind. In shaping our policy toward the Soviet Union, in preparing for my meetings with the General Secretary, I have taken their vision -- a shared vision, subscribed to by East, West, and the proud neutral and non-aligned countries of this continent -- as my guide. I believe the standard the framers of the Final Act set -- including the concept of liberty it embodies -- is a standard for all of us. We can do no less than uphold it and try to see it turn, as the Soviets say, into "life itself."

We in the West will remain firm in our values; strong and vigilant in defense of our interests; ready to negotiate honestly for results of mutual and universal benefit. One lesson we drew again from the events leading up to the Intermediate-range Nuclear Forces Treaty was that, in the world as it is today, peace truly does depend on Western strength and resolve. It is a lesson we will continue to heed.

(Judge)
May 22, 1988
10:00 a.m.

PRESIDENTIAL ADDRESS: ADDRESS ON EAST-WEST RELATIONS
FINLANDIA HALL
HELSINKI, FINLAND
FRIDAY MAY 27, 1988

Jim Potts Advance - Helsinki

Mr. President, Mr. Prime Minister, Ladies and Gentlemen:

It is a particular honor for me to come here today. This year -- the "Year of Friendship," as Congress has proclaimed it, between the United States and Finland -- this year marks the 350th anniversary of the arrival of the first Finns in America and the establishment of a small Scandinavian colony near what is today Wilmington, Delaware. An ancient people in a new world -- that is the story, not only of those Finns, but of all the peoples who braved the seas, to settle in and build my country, a land of freedom for a nation of immigrants.

Yes, they founded a new world, but as they crossed the oceans, the mountains, and the prairies, those who made America carried the old world in their hearts -- the old customs, the family ties, and, most of all, the belief in God, a belief that gave them the moral compass and ethical foundation by which they explored an uncharted frontier and constructed a government and nation of, by, and for the people.

And so, although we Americans became a new people, we also remain an ancient one, for we are guided by ancient and universal values -- values that Prime Minister Holkeri spoke of in Los Angeles this February when, after recalling Finland's internationally recognized position of neutrality, he added that

George Bouton
Finnish desk
647-5669

Finland is "tied to Western values of freedom, democracy, and human rights."

And let me add here that for America, those ties are also the bonds of our friendship. America respects Finland's neutrality. We support Finland's independence. We honor Finland's courageous history. We salute the creative statesmanship that has been Finland's gift to world peace. And in this soaring hall -- which is the great architect Alvar Aalto's statement of hope for Finland's future -- we reaffirm our hope and faith that the friendship between our nations will be unending.

We are gathered here today in this hall because it was here, almost 13 years ago, that the 35 nations of the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe signed the Helsinki Final Act -- a document that embodies the same ethical and moral principles and the same hope for a future of peace that Finns and so many other European immigrants gave America. The Final Act is a singular statement of hope. Its so-called "three baskets" touch on almost every aspect of East-West relations, and taken together form a kind of map through the wilderness of mutual hostility to open fields of peace and to a common home of trust among all of our sovereign nations -- neutrals, non-aligned, and alliance members alike. The Final Act set new standards of conduct for our nations and provided the mechanisms by which to apply those standards.

Yes, the Final Act goes beyond arms control -- once the focus of international dialogue. It reflects the truth that I

have so often noted -- nations do not distrust each other because they are armed; they are armed because they distrust each other. The Final Act grapples with the full range of our underlying differences and deals with East-West relations as an interrelated whole. It reflects the belief of all our countries that human rights are less likely to be abused when a nation's security is less in doubt; that economic relations can contribute to security, but depend on the trust and confidence that come from increasing ties between our peoples, increasing openness, and increasing freedom; and that there is no true international security without respect for human rights.

And beyond establishing these integrated standards, the Final Act establishes a process for progress. It sets up a review procedure to measure performance against standards. And -- despite the doubts of the critics -- for the past 13 years, the signatory states have mustered the political will to keep on working and making progress.

Let me say that it seems particularly appropriate to me that the Final Act is associated so closely with this city and this country. More than any other diplomatic document, the Final Act speaks to the yearning that Finland's longtime President, Urho Kekkonen, spoke of more than a quarter century ago, when he said, in his words, "It is the fervent hope of the Finnish people that barriers be lowered all over Europe and that progress be made along the road of European unity." And he added that this was, as he put it, "for the good of Europe, and thus of humanity as a whole." Those were visionary words. That vision inspired and

State Dept Draft 5-19-88

shaped the drafting of the Final Act and continues to guide us today.

Has the Final Act and what we call the Helsinki process worked or not? Many say it hasn't, but I believe it has.

In the security field, I would point to the most recent fruit of the process -- the Stockholm document on confidence- and security-building measures in Europe. This agreement lays down the rules by which our 35 states notify each other of upcoming military activities in Europe; provide detailed information on these activities in advance; let the others know their plans for very large military activities one to two years in advance and agree not to hold such maneuvers unless this notice is given; invite observers to their larger military activities; and permit on-site inspections to make sure the agreement is honored.

I am happy to note that since our representatives shook hands to seal this agreement a year and a half ago, all 35 states have, by and large, honored both the letter and the spirit of the Stockholm Document. The Western and neutral and non-aligned states have set a strong example in providing full information about their military activities. In April, Finland held its first military activity subject to the Stockholm notification requirements and voluntarily invited observers to it. The Soviet Union and its allies also have a good record of implementation, though they have been less open in handling observers. Ten on-site inspections have been conducted so far, and more and more states are exercising their right to make such inspections. I

can't help but believe that making inspections a matter of routine business will improve openness and enhance confidence.

Nor was Stockholm the end of the process. In Vienna, all 35 signatory states are considering how to strengthen the confidence- and security-building measures, pending progress on human rights.

In the economic field, as in the security field, I believe there has been progress, but of a different kind. Issues and negotiations regarding security are not simple, but military technology makes arms and armies resemble each other enough so that common measures can be confidently applied. Economic relations, by contrast, are bedeviled by systematic differences. Perhaps increases in non-strategic trade can contribute to better relations between East and West, but it is difficult to relate the state-run economies of the East to the essentially free-market economies of the West. Perhaps some of the changes underway in the state-run economies will equip them better to deal with our businessmen, and open new arenas for cooperations. But our work on these issues over the years has already made us understand that differences in systems are serious obstacles to expansion of economic ties, and since understanding of unpleasant realities is part of wisdom, that too, is progress.

The changes taking place in the Eastern countries of the continent go beyond changes in their economic systems and greater openness in their military activities: changes have also begun to occur in the field of human rights, as was called for in the Final Act. The rest of us would like to see the changes that are

being announced actually registered in the law and practice of our Eastern partners, and in the documents under negotiation in the Vienna follow-up to Helsinki conference.

Much has been said about the human rights and humanitarian provisions in the Final Act and the failure of the Eastern bloc to honor them. Yet, for all the bleak winds that have swept the plains of justice since that signing day in 1975, the Accords have taken root in the conscience of humanity and grown in moral and, increasingly, in diplomatic authority. I believe that this is no accident. It reflects an increasing realization that the agenda of East-West relations must be comprehensive -- that security and human rights must be advanced together, or cannot truly be secured at all. But it also shows that the provisions in the Final Act reflect standards that are truly universal in their scope. The Accords embody a fundamental truth, a truth that gathers strength with each passing season, and that will not be denied -- the truth that, like the first Finnish settlers in America, all our ancient peoples find themselves today in a new world, and that, as those early settlers discovered, the greatest creative and moral force in this new world, the greatest hope for survival and success, for peace and happiness, is human freedom.

Yes, freedom -- the right to speak, to print, to assemble, to travel, the right to worship and believe, the right to be different, the right, as the American poet, Henry David Thoreau, wrote, "to march to a different drummer." This is freedom as most Europeans and Americans understand it and freedom as it is embodied in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and, yes,

in the Helsinki Accords. And -- far more than the locomotive or the automobile, the airplane or the rocket, more than radio, television or the computer -- this concept of liberty is the most distinct, peculiar, and powerful invention of the civilization we all share.

Indeed, without this freedom there would have been no mechanical inventions, for inventions are eccentricities. The men and women who create them are visionaries, just like artists and writers. They see what others fail to see and trust their insights when others don't. The same freedom that permits literature and the arts to flourish, the same freedom that allows one to attend church, synagogue, or mosque without apprehension, that same freedom from oppression and supervision is the freedom that has given us -- the peoples of Western Europe and North America -- our dynamism, our economic growth, and our inventiveness. Together with Japan, Australia, and others, we have lived in this state of freedom, this House of Democracy since the end of the Second World War. Because of that, because of the liberty and popular rule we have shared, today we also share a prosperity more widely distributed and extensive, a political order more tolerant and humane than has ever before been known on earth.

To see not simply the immediate but the historic importance of this, we should remember how far so many of our nations have traveled -- and how desolate the future of freedom and democracy once seemed. There is a story that illustrates what I'm saying. It was shortly after the Second World War, and George Orwell

recalled saying to Arthur Koestler that "History stopped in 1936," to which Koestler "nodded in immediate understanding." Orwell added that "we were both thinking of totalitarianism."

For decades, the totalitarian temptation, in one form or another, has beckoned to mankind, also promising freedom -- but of a different kind than the one we celebrate today. This concept of liberty is, as the Czechoslovak writer Milan Kundera has put it, "the age-old dream of a world where everybody would live in harmony, united by a single common will and faith, without secrets from one another" -- the freedom of imposed perfection.

Fifty, forty, even as recently as thirty years ago, the contest between this utopian concept of freedom on one hand and the democratic concept of freedom on the other seemed a close one. Promises of a perfect world lured many Western thinkers and millions of others besides. And many believed in the confident prediction of history's inevitable triumph.

Few do today. Just as democratic freedom has proven itself incredibly fertile -- fertile not merely in a material sense, but also in the abundance it has brought forth in the human spirit -- so too utopianism has proven brutal and barren.

Albert Camus once predicted that, in his words, "When revolution in the name of power and of history becomes a murderous and immoderate mechanism, a new rebellion is consecrated in the name of moderation and of life." Isn't this exactly what we see happening across the mountains and plains of Europe and even beyond the Urals today? In Western Europe,

support for utopian ideologies -- including support among intellectuals -- has all but collapsed, while in the non-democratic countries, leaders grapple with the internal contradictions of their system and some ask how they can make that system better and more productive.

In a sense, the front-line in the competition of ideas that has played in Europe and America for more than 70 years has shifted East. Once it was the democracies that doubted their own view of freedom and wondered whether utopian systems might not be better. Today, the doubt is on the other side.

Schedule - Arrival Ceremony 5-29-88

In just two days, I will meet in Moscow with General Secretary Gorbachev. It will be our fourth set of face-to-face talks since 1985. The General Secretary and I have developed a broad agenda for U.S.-Soviet relations -- an agenda linked directly to the agenda of the Final Act.

Pres Doc Geneva 11-16-85 Reykjavik 10-86 Washington 12-10-87

State Dept Draft 5-19-88

Yes, as does the Final Act, we will discuss security issues. We will pursue progress in arms control negotiations across the board and continue our exchanges on the regional issues.

Yes, we will also discuss economic issues, although, as in the Helsinki process, we have seen in recent years how much differences in our systems inhibit expanded ties, and how difficult it is to divorce economic relations from human rights and other elements of the relationship.

Final Act - Historic Documents of 1975 Section IX P565

And, yes, as our countries did at Helsinki, we will take up other bilateral areas, as well -- including scientific, cultural and people-to-people exchanges, where we have been hard at work

identifying new ways to cooperate. In this area, in particular, I believe we'll see some good results before the week is over.

And like the Final Act, our agenda now includes human rights as an integral component. We have developed our dialogue, and put in place new mechanisms for discussion. The General Secretary has spoken often and forthrightly of the problems confronting the Soviet Union. In his campaign to address these shortcomings, he talks of "glasnost" and "perestroika" -- openness and restructuring, words that to our ears have a particularly welcome sound. And since he began his campaign, things have happened that we -- all of us in the House of Democracy -- applaud.

The list includes the release from labor camps or exile of people like Andrei Sakharov, Irina Ratushinskaya, Anatoliy Koryagin, Josif Begun, and many other prisoners of conscience; the publication of books like Dr. Zhivago; the distribution of movies like Repentance, that are critical of aspects of the Soviet past and present; allowing higher levels of emigration; greater toleration of dissent; General Secretary Gorbachev's recent statements on religious toleration; the beginning of Soviet withdrawal from Afghanistan.

All this is new and good. But at the same time, there is another list, defined not by us but by the standard of the Helsinki Final Act and the sovereign choice of all participants, including the Soviet Union to subscribe to it. We need look no farther through the Final Act to see where Soviet practice does not -- or does not yet -- measure up to Soviet commitment.

Final Act 8-1-75 Historic Documents of 1975

Thirteen years after the Final Act was signed, it is difficult to understand why cases of divided families and blocked marriages should remain on the East-West agenda; or why Soviet citizens who wish to exercise their right to emigrate should be subject to artificial quotas and arbitrary rulings. And what are we to think of the continued suppression of those who wish to practice their religious beliefs. Over three hundred men and women whom the world sees as political prisoners have been released. There remains no reason why the Soviet Union cannot release all people still in jail for expression of political or religious belief, or for organizing to monitor the Helsinki Act.

Lisa Jameson NSC x3912

"Perestroika" by Mikhail Gorbachev p 194

The Soviets talk about a "common European home," and define it in terms of geography. But what is it that unifies the nations of Western Europe today -- and also, I believe, unifies the peoples, though not the regimes, of Eastern Europe? What is it but the Judeo-Christian tradition and its teachings about the inalienable rights and dignity of all God's children? What is it but a common commitment to pluralistic democracy? What but a common dedication to the democratic concept of liberty? This is what marks the common European home.

Ibid

Mr. Gorbachev has spoken of, in his words, "the artificiality and temporariness of the bloc-to-bloc confrontation and the archaic nature of the 'iron curtain.'" I join him in this belief, and would welcome a sign that the Soviets and their allies are ready to embrace the values that not only unify but define contemporary Western European civilization and its grateful American offspring.

Some 30 years ago, during another period of relative openness, the Italian socialist, Pietro Nenni, who was a friend of the Soviet Union, warned that it was wrong to think that the relaxation could be permanent in, as he said, "the absence of any system of judicial guarantees." And he added that, again in his words, "only the complete restoration of democracy and liberty" could prevent backsliding.

There are a number of steps, in addition to human rights that the Soviet leaders can take if they wish to demonstrate that glasnost and democratization are here to stay. First, they can agree to tear down the Berlin Wall and all barriers between Eastern and Western Europe. They can join us in making Berlin itself an all-European center of communications, meetings, and travel, and allowing internal as well as external travel.

They can also give legal and practical protection to free expression and worship. Let me interject here that at one time Moscow was known as the "City of the Forty Forties," because there were more than 1,600 belfries in the churches of the city. Today there are few functioning churches and almost no bells. Mr. Gorbachev recently said, as he put it, "believers are Soviet people, workers, patriots, and they have the full right to express their conviction with dignity." I applaud Mr. Gorbachev's statement. What a magnificent demonstration of goodwill it would be for the Soviet leadership for church bells to be heard again not only in Moscow but throughout the Soviet Union.

But beyond these particular steps, there is a deeper question. How can the countries of the East not only grant but guarantee the protection of rights? We know, of course, of a simple and profound starting place. As the French constitutional philosopher, Montesquieu, wrote more than two centuries ago, "There is no liberty, if the power of judging be not separated" from the other powers of government. The complete independence of the judiciary is essential to the guarantee of human rights.

So, too, is popular control over those who make the laws. Secret ballots and the freedom to form political parties and run candidates -- these are among the elements of a system in which human rights enjoy institutional protection.

I know that for the East bloc countries such steps are difficult, and some may say it is unrealistic to call for them. Some said, in 1975, that the standards set forth in the Final Act were unrealistic; that the comprehensive agenda it embodied was unrealistic. Some said, earlier in this decade, that calling for global elimination of U.S. and Soviet intermediate-range nuclear missiles was unrealistic; that calling for 50 percent reductions in strategic offensive weapons was unrealistic; that the Soviets would never withdraw from Afghanistan. Is it realistic to pretend that rights are truly protected when there are no effective safeguards against arbitrary rule? It is realistic, when the Soviet leadership itself is calling for glasnost and democratization, to say that judicial guarantees, or the independence of the judiciary, or popular control over those that draft the laws, or freedom to associate for political purposes,

are unrealistic? And, finally, is it realistic to say that peace is truly secure when political systems are less than open. No less an observer than Friedrich Engels wrote more than a century-and-a-half-ago of a now defunct autocratic regime that, in his words, "As soon as Russia has... internal party struggles [and] a constitutional form under which these party struggles may be fought without violent convulsions... the traditional Russian policy of conquest is a thing of the past."

The leaders who met in this room to sign the Final Act were visionaries of the most practical kind. In shaping our policy toward the Soviet Union, in preparing for my meetings with the General Secretary, I have taken their vision -- a shared vision, subscribed to by East, West, and the proud neutral and non-aligned countries of this continent -- as my guide. I believe the standard the framers of the Final Act set -- including the concept of liberty they defined -- is a standard for all of us. We can do no less than uphold it and try to see it enforced.

We in the West will remain firm in our values; strong and vigilant in defense of our interests; ready to negotiate honestly for results of mutual and universal benefit. One lesson we drew again from the events leading up to the Intermediate-range Nuclear Forces Treaty was that, in the world as it is today, peace truly does depend on Western strength and resolve. It is a lesson we will continue to heed.

But we are also prepared to work with the Soviets and their allies whenever they are ready to work with us. By strength we

do not mean diktat, that is, an imposed settlement; we mean confident negotiation. The road ahead may be long -- but not so long as our countries had before them 44 years ago when Finland's great President, J.K. Paasikivi, told a nation that had shown the world uncommon courage in a harrowing time: "A path rises up the slope from the floor of the valley. At times the ascent is gradual, at other times steeper. But all the time one comes closer and closer to free, open spaces, above which God's ever brighter sky can be seen. The way up will be difficult.... But every step will take us closer to open vistas."

I believe that in Moscow, Mr. Gorbachev and I can take another step toward a brighter future and a safer world. And I believe that, for the sake of all our ancient peoples, this new world must be a place both of democratic freedom and of peace. It must be a world in which the spirit of the Helsinki Final Act guides all our countries like a great beacon of hope and in which the House of Democracy shelters all mankind for ages to come.

Thank you and God bless you.