

Ronald Reagan Presidential Library Digital Library Collections

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

Collection: Speechwriting, White House Office of:
Speech Drafts, 1981-1989

Folder Title: Joint Session of Congress: Report on
Geneva (Noonan) (Timmons/White) 11/21/1985 (2)

Box: 240

To see more digitized collections visit:

<https://reaganlibrary.gov/archives/digital-library>

To see all Ronald Reagan Presidential Library inventories visit:

<https://reaganlibrary.gov/document-collection>

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

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

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

Thank you ladies and gentlemen.

Mr. Speaker, Mr. President, Members of the Congress, distinguished guests, my fellow Americans:

It's great to be home. Nancy and I thank you for this wonderful homecoming. And before I go on I want to say a personal thank you to Nancy. She was an outstanding ambassador of good will for all of us. Thanks, partner.

Mr. Speaker, Senator Dole, I want you to know your statements of support were and are greatly appreciated. You can't imagine how much it means in dealing with the Soviets to have the Congress, the allies, and the American people firmly behind me.

As you know, I have just come from Geneva and talks with General Secretary Gorbachev. In the past few days, we spent over 15 hours in various meetings with the General Secretary and the members of his official party. Approximately 5 of those hours were talks between Mr. Gorbachev and myself, one on one. That was the best part -- Our fireside summit.

There will be, I know, a great deal of commentary and opinion as to what the meetings produced and what they were like. There were over 3,000 reporters in Geneva, so it's possible there will be 3,000 opinions on what happened. Maybe it's the old broadcaster in me but I decided to file my own report directly to you.

We met, as we had to meet. I had called for a fresh start -- and we made that start. I can't claim we had a meeting

of the minds on such fundamentals as ideology or national purpose -- but we understand each other better. That's key to peace. I gained a better perspective; I feel he did, too.

It was a constructive meeting. So constructive, in fact, that I look forward to welcoming Mr. Gorbachev to the United States next year. And I have accepted his invitation to go to Moscow the following year.

I found Mr. Gorbachev to be an energetic defender of Soviet policy. He was an eloquent speaker, and a good listener. Our subject matter was shaped by the facts of this century.

These past 40 years have not been an easy time for the West or the world. You know the facts; there is no need to recite the historical record. Suffice it to say that the United States cannot afford illusions about the nature of the U.S.S.R. We cannot assume that their ideology and purpose will change. This implies enduring competition. Our task is to assure that this competition remains peaceful. With all that divides us, we cannot afford to let confusion complicate things further. We must be clear with each other, and direct. We must pay each other the tribute of candor.

When I took the oath of office for the first time, we began dealing with the Soviet Union in a way that was more realistic than in the recent past. And so, in a very real sense, preparations for the summit started not months ago but 5 years ago when -- with the help of Congress -- we began strengthening our economy, restoring our national will, and rebuilding our defenses and alliances. America is once again strong -- and our

strength has given us the ability to speak with confidence and see that no true opportunity to advance freedom and peace is lost. We must not now abandon policies that work. I need your continued support to keep America strong.

That is the history behind the Geneva summit, that is the context in which it occurred. And may I add that we were especially eager that our meetings give a push to important talks already under way on reducing nuclear weapons. On this subject it would be foolish not to go the extra mile -- or in this case the extra 4,000 miles.

We discussed the great issues of our time. I made clear before the first meeting that no question would be swept aside, no issue buried, just because either side found it uncomfortable or inconvenient.

I brought these questions to the summit and put them before Mr. Gorbachev.

We discussed nuclear arms and how to reduce them. I explained our proposals for equitable, verifiable, and deep reductions. I outlined my conviction that our proposals would make not just for a world that feels safer but that really is safer.

I am pleased to report tonight that General Secretary Gorbachev and I did make a measure of progress here. While we still have a long ways to go, we're at least heading in the right direction. We moved arms control forward from where we were last January, when the Soviets returned to the table.

We are both instructing our negotiators to hasten their vital work. The world is waiting for results.

Specifically, we agreed in Geneva that each side should move to cut offensive nuclear arms by 50 percent in appropriate categories. In our joint statement we called for early progress on this, turning the talks toward our chief goal, offensive reductions. We called for an interim accord on intermediate-range nuclear forces, leading, I hope, to the complete elimination of this class of missiles. All this with tough verification.

We also made progress in combatting together the spread of nuclear weapons, an arms control area in which we've cooperated effectively over the years. We are also opening a dialogue on combatting the spread and use of chemical weapons, while moving to ban them altogether. Other arms control dialogues -- in Vienna on conventional forces, and in Stockholm on lessening the chances for surprise attack in Europe -- also received a boost. Finally, we agreed to begin work on risk reduction centers, a decision that should give special satisfaction to Senators Nunn and Warner who so ably promoted this idea.

I described our Strategic Defense Initiative -- our research effort that envisions the possibility of defensive systems which could ultimately protect all nations against the danger of nuclear war. This discussion produced a very direct exchange of views.

Mr. Gorbachev insisted that we might use a strategic defense system to put offensive weapons into space and establish nuclear superiority.

I made it clear that S.D.I. has nothing to do with offensive weapons; that, instead, we are investigating non-nuclear defensive systems that would only threaten offensive missiles, not people. If our research succeeds, it will bring much closer the safer, more stable world we seek. Nations could defend themselves against missile attack, and mankind, at long last, escape the prison of mutual terror -- this is my dream.

So I welcomed the chance to tell Mr. Gorbachev that we are a Nation that defends, rather than attacks, that our alliances are defensive, not offensive. We don't seek nuclear superiority. We do not seek a first strike advantage over the Soviet Union. Indeed, one of my fundamental arms control objectives is to get rid of first strike weapons altogether. This is why we have proposed a 50-percent reduction in the most threatening nuclear weapons, especially those that could carry out a first strike.

I went further in expressing our peaceful intentions. I described our proposal in the Geneva negotiations for a reciprocal program of open laboratories in strategic defense research. We are offering to permit Soviet experts to see first hand that S.D.I. does not involve offensive weapons. American scientists would be allowed to visit comparable facilities of the Soviet strategic defense program, which, in fact, has involved much more than research for many years.

Finally, I reassured Mr. Gorbachev on another point. I promised that if our research reveals that a defense against nuclear missiles is possible, we would sit down with our allies and the Soviet Union to see how together we could replace all strategic ballistic missiles with such a defense, which threatens no one.

We discussed threats to the peace in several regions of the world. I explained my proposals for a peace process to stop the wars in Afghanistan, Nicaragua, Ethiopia, Angola, and Cambodia, where insurgencies that speak for the people are pitted against regimes which obviously do not represent the will or the approval of the people. I tried to be very clear about where our sympathies lie; I believe I succeeded.

We discussed human rights. We Americans believe that history teaches no clearer lesson than this: Those countries which respect the rights of their own people tend, inevitably, to respect the rights of their neighbors. Human rights, therefore, is not an abstract moral issue -- it is a peace issue.

Finally, we discussed the barriers to communication between our societies, and I elaborated on my proposals for real people-to-people contacts on a wide scale.

Americans should know the people of the Soviet Union -- their hopes and fears and the facts of their lives. And citizens of the Soviet Union need to know of America's deep desire for peace and our unwavering attachment to freedom.

As you can see, our talks were wide ranging. Let me at this point tell you what we agreed upon and what we didn't.

We remain far apart on a number of issues, as had to be expected. However, we reached agreement on a number of matters, and, as I mentioned, we agreed to continue meeting and this is important and very good. There's always room for movement, action, and progress when people are talking to each other instead of about each other.

We have concluded a new agreement designed to bring the best of America's artists and academics to the Soviet Union. The exhibits that will be included in this exchange are one of the most effective ways for the average Soviet citizen to learn about our way of life. This agreement will also expand the opportunities for Americans to experience the Soviet people's rich cultural heritage -- because their artists and academics will be coming here.

We have also decided to go forward with a number of people-to-people initiatives that will go beyond greater contact not only between the political leaders of our two countries but our respective students, teachers, and others as well. We have emphasized youth exchanges. This will help break down stereotypes, build friendships, and, frankly, provide an alternative to propaganda.

We have agreed to establish a new Soviet Consulate in New York and a new American Consulate in Kiev. This will bring a permanent U.S. presence to the Ukraine for the first time in decades.

We have also, together with the government of Japan, concluded a Pacific Air Safety Agreement with the Soviet Union.

This is designed to set up cooperative measures to improve civil air safety in that region. What happened before must never be allowed to happen again.

As a potential way of dealing with the energy needs of the world of the future, we have also advocated international cooperation to explore the feasibility of developing fusion energy.

All of these steps are part of a long-term effort to build a more stable relationship with the Soviet Union. No one ever said it would be easy. But we've come a long way.

As for Soviet expansionism in a number of regions of the world -- while there is little chance of immediate change, we will continue to support the heroic efforts of those who fight for freedom. But we have also agreed to continue -- and to intensify -- our meetings with the Soviets on this and other regional conflicts and to work toward political solutions.

We know the limits as well as the promise of summit meetings. This is, after all, the eleventh summit of the post-war era -- and still the differences endure. But we believe continued meetings between the leaders of the United States and the Soviet Union can help bridge those differences.

The fact is, every new day begins with possibilities; it's up to us to fill it with the things that move us toward progress and peace. Hope, therefore, is a realistic attitude -- and despair an uninteresting little vice.

And so: was our journey worthwhile?

Thirty years ago, when he too had just returned from a summit in Geneva, President Eisenhower said, "...the wide gulf that separates so far East and West... (is)... wide and deep." Today, three decades later, that is still true.

But, yes, this meeting was worthwhile for both sides. A new realism spawned the summit; the summit itself was a good start; and now our byword must be: Steady as we go.

I am, as you are, impatient for results. But goodwill and good hopes do not always yield lasting results. Quick fixes don't fix big problems.

Just as we must avoid illusions on our side, so we must dispel them on the Soviet side. I have made it clear to Mr. Gorbachev that we must reduce the mistrust and suspicions between us if we are to do such things as reduce arms, and this will take deeds, not words alone. I believe he is in agreement.

Where do we go from here? Well, our desire for improved relations is strong. We're ready and eager for step-by-step progress. We know that peace is not just the absence of war. We don't want a phony peace or a frail peace; we did not go in pursuit of some kind of illusory detente. We can't be satisfied with cosmetic improvements that won't stand the test of time. We want real peace.

As I flew back this evening, I had many thoughts. In just a few days families across America will gather to celebrate Thanksgiving. And again, as our forefathers who voyaged to America, we travelled to Geneva with peace as our goal and freedom as our guide. For there can be no greater good than the

quest for peace -- nor no finer purpose than the preservation of freedom.

It is 350 years since the first Thanksgiving, when Pilgrims and Indians huddled together on the edge of an unknown continent. And now here we are gathered together on the edge of an unknown future -- but, like our forefathers, really not so much afraid, but full of hope, and trusting in God, as ever.

Thank you for allowing me to talk to you this evening. And God bless you all.

(Noonan/BE)

November 21, 1985
12:30 p.m. (Geneva)

PRESIDENTIAL ADDRESS: JOINT SESSION OF THE CONGRESS
REPORT ON GENEVA
THURSDAY, NOVEMBER 21, 1985

Thank you ladies and gentlemen.

Mr. Speaker, Mr. President, Members of the Congress,
distinguished guests, my fellow Americans:

It's great to be home. Nancy and I thank you for this
wonderful homecoming. And before I go on I want to say a
personal thank you to Nancy. She was an outstanding ambassador
of good will for all of us. Thanks, partner.

Mr. Speaker, Senator Dole, I want you to know your
statements of support were and are greatly appreciated. You
can't imagine how much it means in dealing with the Soviets to
have the Congress, the allies, and the American people firmly
behind me.

As you know, I have just come from Geneva and talks with
General Secretary Gorbachev. In the past few days, we spent over
15 hours in various meetings with the General Secretary and the
members of his official party. Approximately 5 of those hours
were talks between Mr. Gorbachev and myself, one on one. That
was the best part -- Our fireside summit.

There will be, I know, a great deal of commentary and
opinion as to what the meetings produced and what they were like.
There were over 3,000 reporters in Geneva, so it's possible there
will be 3,000 opinions on what happened. Maybe it's the old
broadcaster in me but I decided to file my own report directly to
you.

We met, as we had to meet. I had called for a fresh start -- and we made that start. I can't claim we had a meeting of the minds on such fundamentals as ideology or national purpose -- but we understand each other better. That's key to peace. I gained a better perspective; I feel he did, too.

It was a constructive meeting. So constructive, in fact, that Mr. Gorbachev has accepted our invitation to visit the United States next year. And I have accepted his invitation to go to Moscow the following year.

I found Mr. Gorbachev to be an energetic defender of Soviet policy. He was an eloquent speaker, and a good listener. Our subject matter was shaped by the facts of this century.

These past 40 years have not been an easy time for the West or the world. You know the facts; there is no need to recite the historical record. Suffice it to say that the United States cannot afford illusions about the nature of the U.S.S.R. We cannot assume that their ideology and purpose will change. This implies enduring competition. Our task is to assure that this competition remains peaceful. With all that divides us, we cannot afford to let confusion complicate things further. We must be clear with each other, and direct. We must pay each other the tribute of candor.

When I took the oath of office for the first time, we began dealing with the Soviet Union in a way that was more realistic than in the recent past. And so, in a very real sense, preparations for the summit started not months ago but 5 years ago when -- with the help of Congress -- we began strengthening

our economy, restoring our national will, and rebuilding our defenses and alliances. America is once again strong -- and our strength has given us the ability to speak with confidence and see that no true opportunity to advance freedom and peace is lost.

That is the history behind the Geneva summit, that is the context in which it occurred. And may I add that we were especially eager that our meetings give a push to important talks already under way on reducing nuclear weapons. On this subject it would be foolish not to go the extra mile -- or in this case the extra 4,000 miles.

We discussed the great issues of our time. I made clear before the first meeting that no question would be swept aside, no issue buried, just because either side found it uncomfortable or inconvenient.

I brought these questions to the summit and put them before Mr. Gorbachev.

We discussed nuclear arms and how to reduce them. I explained our proposals for equitable, verifiable, and deep reductions. I outlined my conviction that our proposals would make not just for a world that feels safer but that really is safer.

I am pleased to report tonight that General Secretary Gorbachev and I did make a measure of progress here. While we still have a long ways to go, we're at least heading in the right direction. We moved arms control forward from where we were last January, when the Soviets returned to the table.

We are both instructing our negotiators to hasten their vital work. The world is waiting for results.

Specifically, we agreed in Geneva that each side should move to cut offensive nuclear arms by 50 percent in appropriate categories, and reach an interim accord on intermediate-range missiles, leading, we hope, to the complete elimination of this class of missiles. All this with tough verification.

We also made progress in combatting together the spread of nuclear weapons, an arms control area in which we've cooperated nicely over the years. We are also opening a dialogue on combatting the spread of chemical weapons, while moving to ban them altogether. Other arms control dialogues -- in Vienna on conventional arms, and in Stockholm on lessening the chances for surprise attack in Europe -- also received a boost. Finally, we agreed to begin work on risk reduction centers.

I described our Strategic Defense Initiative -- our research effort that envisions the possibility of defensive systems which could ultimately protect all nations against the danger of nuclear war. This discussion produced a very direct exchange of views.

Mr. Gorbachev insisted that we might use a strategic defense system to put offensive weapons into space and establish nuclear superiority.

I made it clear that S.D.I. has nothing to do with offensive weapons; that, instead, we are investigating non-nuclear defensive systems that would only threaten offensive missiles, not people. If our research succeeds, it will bring much closer

the safer, more stable world we seek. Nations could defend themselves against missile attack, and mankind at long last escape the prison of mutual terror -- this is my dream.

So I welcomed the chance to tell Mr. Gorbachev that we are a Nation that defends, rather than attacks, that our alliances are defensive, not offensive. We don't seek nuclear superiority. We do not seek a first strike advantage over the Soviet Union. Indeed, one of my fundamental arms control objectives is to get rid of first strike weapons altogether. This is why we have proposed a 50-percent reduction in the most threatening nuclear weapons, especially those that could carry out a first strike.

I went further in expressing our peaceful intentions. I described our proposal in the Geneva negotiations for a program of open laboratories in strategic defense research. We are offering to permit Soviet experts to see first hand that S.D.I. does not involve offensive weapons. American scientists would be allowed to visit comparable facilities of the Soviet strategic defense program, which, in fact, has involved much more than research for many years.

Finally, I reassured Mr. Gorbachev on another point. I promised that if our research reveals that a defense against nuclear missiles is possible, we would sit down with our allies and the Soviet Union to see how together we could replace all nuclear missiles with such a defense, which threatens no one.

We discussed threats to the peace in several regions of the world. I explained my proposals for a peace process to stop the wars in Afghanistan, Nicaragua, Ethiopia, Angola, and Cambodia,

where insurgencies that speak for the people are pitted against regimes which obviously do not represent the will or the approval of the people. I tried to be very clear about where our sympathies lie; I believe I succeeded.

We discussed human rights. We Americans believe that history teaches no clearer lesson than this: Those countries which respect the rights of their own people tend, inevitably, to respect the rights of their neighbors. Human rights, therefore, is not an abstract moral issue -- it is a peace issue.

Finally, we discussed the barriers to communication between our societies, and I elaborated on our proposals for real people-to-people contacts on a wide scale.

Americans should know the people of the Soviet Union -- their hopes and fears and the facts of their lives. And citizens of the Soviet Union need to know of America's deep desire for peace and our unwavering attachment to freedom.

As you can see, our talks were wide ranging. Let me at this point tell you what we agreed upon and what we didn't.

We remain far apart on a number of issues, as had to be expected. However, we reached agreement on a number of matters, and, as I mentioned, we agreed to continue meeting and this is important and very good. There's always room for movement, action, and progress when people are talking to each other instead of about each other.

We have concluded a new agreement designed to bring the best of America's artists and academics to the Soviet Union. The exhibits that will be included in this exchange are one of the

most effective ways for the average Soviet citizen to learn about our way of life. This agreement will also expand the opportunities for Americans to experience the Soviet people's rich cultural heritage -- because their artists and academics will be coming here.

We have also decided to go forward with a number of people-to-people initiatives that will provide greater contact not only between the political leaders of our two countries but our respective students, teachers, and others as well. This will help break down stereotypes, build friendships, and, frankly, provide an alternative to propaganda.

We have agreed to establish a new Soviet Consulate in New York and a new U.S. Consulate in Kiev. This will bring an official American presence to the Ukraine for the first time in decades.

We have also, together with the government of Japan, concluded a Pacific Air Safety Agreement with the Soviet Union. This is designed to set up cooperative measures to improve civil air safety in that region. What happened before must never be allowed to happen again.

As a way of dealing with the energy needs of the world of the future, we have also agreed with the Soviets to invite other nations to join us in an international effort to explore the feasibility of developing fusion energy.

All of these steps are part of a long-term effort to build a more stable relationship with the Soviet Union. No one ever said it would be easy. But we've come a long way.

As for Soviet expansionism in a number of regions of the world -- while there is little chance of immediate change, we will continue to support the heroic efforts of those who fight for freedom. But we have also agreed to continue -- and to intensify -- our meetings with the Soviets on this and other regional conflicts and to work toward political solutions.

We know the limits as well as the promise of summit meetings. This is, after all, the eleventh summit of the post-war era -- and still the differences endure. But we believe continued meetings between the leaders of the United States and the Soviet Union can help bridge those differences.

The fact is, every new day begins with possibilities; each new day is empty of history; it's up to us to fill it with the things that move us toward progress and peace. Hope, therefore, is a realistic attitude -- and despair an uninteresting little vice.

And so: was our journey worthwhile?

Thirty years ago, when he too had just returned from a summit in Geneva, President Eisenhower said, "A the wide gulf that separates so far East and West. A. This is A wide and deep." Today, three decades later, that is still true.

But, yes, this meeting was worthwhile for both sides. A new realism spawned the summit; the summit itself was a good start; and now our byword must be: Steady as we go.

I am, as you are, impatient for results. But goodwill and good hopes do not always yield lasting results. Quick fixes don't fix big problems.

Just as we must avoid illusions on our side, so we must dispel them on the Soviet side. I have made it clear to Mr. Gorbachev that we must reduce the mistrust and suspicions between us if we are to do such things as reduce arms, and this will take deeds, not words alone. I believe he is in agreement.

Where do we go from here? Well, our desire for improved relations is strong. We're ready and eager for step-by-step progress. We know that peace is not just the absence of war. We don't want a phony peace or a frail peace; we did not go in pursuit of some kind of make-believe detente. We can't be satisfied with cosmetic improvements that won't stand the test of time. We want real peace.

As I flew back this evening, I had many thoughts. In just a few days families across America will gather to celebrate Thanksgiving. And again, as our forefathers who voyaged to America, we travelled to Geneva with peace as our goal and freedom as our guide. For there can be no greater good than the quest for peace -- nor no finer purpose than the preservation of freedom.

It is 350 years since the first Thanksgiving, when Pilgrims and Indians huddled together on the edge of an unknown continent. And now here we are gathered together on the edge of an unknown future -- but, like our forefathers, really not so much afraid, and full of hope, and trusting in God, as ever.

Thank you for allowing me to talk to you this evening. And God bless you all.

SECRET

CLASSIFICATION

CIRCLE ONE BELOW

MODE

PAGES 10

IMMEDIATE

SECURE FAX # 104

DTG 22 04 34Z NOV 85

PRIORITY

ADMIN FAX # _____

RELEASER _____

ROUTINE

RECORD # _____

FROM/LOCATION

1. SARA EMERY/GENEVA

TO/LOCATION/TIME OF RECEIPT

1. DONNA TARANTO -- Speechwriters' office, Room 100/WHITE HOUSE

2. Bob Pearson (Attn: Brian Merchant)

3. TOP: 210541Z

4. Merchant

5. _____

6. _____

7. _____

INFORMATION ADDRESSEES/LOCATION/TIME OF RECEIPT

1. _____

2. _____

SPECIAL INSTRUCTIONS/REMARKS:

7805

Donna, This is the latest draft, please proof.

Thanks.

COMM CENTER: Please deliver at opening of business Thursday,
November 21st.

SECRET

CLASSIFICATION

UNCLASSIFIED UPON REMOVAL
OF CLASSIFIED ENCLOSURE(S)

(Noonan/BE)
November 21, 1985
5:30 a.m. (Geneva)

PRESIDENTIAL ADDRESS: JOINT SESSION OF THE CONGRESS
REPORT ON GENEVA
THURSDAY, NOVEMBER 21, 1985

Thank you ladies and gentlemen.

Mr. Speaker, Mr. President, Members of the Congress,
distinguished guests, my fellow Americans:

It's great to be home. Nancy and I thank you for this wonderful homecoming. And before I go on I want to say a personal thank you to Nancy. She was an outstanding ambassador of good will for all of us. Thanks, partner.

Mr. Speaker, Senator Dole, I want you to know your statements of support were and are greatly appreciated. You can't imagine how much it means in dealing with the Soviets to have the Congress, the allies, and the American people firmly behind me.

As you know, I have just come from Geneva and talks with General Secretary Gorbachev. In the past few days, we spent over 15 hours in various meetings with the General Secretary and the members of his official party. Approximately 5 of those hours were talks between Mr. Gorbachev and myself, one on one. That was the best part.

There will be, I know, a great deal of commentary and opinion as to what the meetings produced and what they were like. There were over 3,000 reporters in Geneva, so there will be at least 3,000 opinions on what happened. Maybe it's the old broadcaster in me but I thought I'd file my own report directly to you.

We met, as we had to meet. I had called for a fresh start -- and we made that start. I can't claim we had a meeting of the minds on such fundamentals as ideology or national purpose -- but we understand each other better. That's key to peace. I gained a better perspective; I feel he did, too.

In short, it was a constructive meeting. So constructive, in fact, that Mr. Gorbachev this morning accepted our invitation to come and visit the United States next year. And a year following I will be going to Moscow.

I found Mr. Gorbachev to be an energetic defender of Soviet policy. He was quite a talker, and, I believe, a good listener. Our subject matter was shaped by the facts of this century.

These past 40 years have not been an easy time for the West or the world. You know the facts; there is no need to recite the historical record. Suffice it to say that the United States cannot afford illusions about the nature of the U.S.S.R. We cannot assume that their ideology and purpose will change. This implies enduring competition. Our task is to assure that this competition remains peaceful. With all that divides us, we cannot afford to let confusion complicate things further. We must be clear with each other, and direct. We must pay each other the tribute of candor.

When I took the oath of office for the first time, we began dealing with the Soviet Union in a way that was more realistic than in the recent past. And so, in a very real sense, preparations for the summit started not months ago but 5 years ago when -- with the help of Congress -- we began strengthening

our economy, restoring our national will, and rebuilding our defenses and alliances. America is once again strong -- and our strength has given us the ability to speak with confidence and see that no true opportunity to advance freedom and peace is lost.

That is the history behind the Geneva summit, that is the context in which it occurred. And may I add that we were especially eager that our meetings give a push to important talks already under way on reducing nuclear weapons. On this subject it would be foolish not to go the extra mile -- or in this case the extra 4,000 miles.

We discussed the great issues of our time. I made clear before the first meeting that no question would be swept aside, no issue buried, just because one side found it uncomfortable or inconvenient.

I brought these questions to the summit and I put them before Mr. Gorbachev.

We discussed nuclear arms and how to reduce them. I explained our proposals for equitable, verifiable, and deep reductions. I outlined my conviction that our proposals would make not just for a world that feels safer but that really is safer.

I am pleased to report tonight that General Secretary Gorbachev and I did make a measure of progress here. While we still have a long ways to go, we're at least heading in the right direction. We moved arms control down the road from where we

were last January, when the Soviets returned to the table after their walk-out.

We are both instructing our negotiators to hasten their vital work. The world is waiting for results.

Specifically, we agreed in Geneva that each side should move to cut offensive nuclear arms by 50 percent in appropriate categories, and reach an interim accord on intermediate-range missiles, leading, we hope, to the complete elimination of this class of missiles. All this with tough verification. No cheating allowed.

We also made some progress in together combatting the spread of nuclear weapons, an arms control area in which we've cooperated nicely over the years. We are also opening a dialogue on combatting the spread of chemical weapons, while moving to ban them altogether. Other arms control dialogues -- in Vienna on conventional arms, and in Stockholm on lessening the chances for surprise attack in Europe -- also received a boost. Finally, we agreed to begin work on risk reduction centers.

I described our Strategic Defense Initiative -- our research effort that envisions the possibility of defensive systems which could ultimately protect all nations against the danger of nuclear war. This discussion produced a very direct exchange of views.

Mr. Gorbachev insisted that we might use a strategic defense system to put offensive weapons into space and establish nuclear superiority.

I made it clear that S.D.I. has nothing to do with offensive weapons; that, instead, we are investigating non-nuclear defensive systems that would only threaten offensive missiles, not people. If our research succeeds, it will bring much closer the safer, more stable world we seek. Nations could defend themselves against missile attack, and mankind at long last escape the prison of mutual terror -- this is my dream.

So I welcomed the chance to tell Mr. Gorbachev that we are a Nation that defends, rather than attacks, that our alliances are defensive, not offensive. We don't seek nuclear superiority. We do not seek a first strike advantage over the Soviet Union. Indeed, one of my fundamental arms control objectives is to get rid of first strike weapons altogether. This is why we have proposed a 50-percent reduction in the most threatening nuclear weapons, especially those that could carry out a first strike.

I went further in expressing our peaceful intentions. I described our proposal in the Geneva negotiations for a program of open laboratories in strategic defense research. We are offering to permit Soviet experts to see first hand that S.D.I. does not involve offensive weapons. American scientists would be allowed to visit comparable facilities of the Soviet strategic defense program, which, in fact, has involved much more than research for many years.

Finally, I reassured Mr. Gorbachev on another point. I promised that if our research bears fruit, prior to any decision on deployment of defensive systems, the U.S. -- after consulting with our allies -- would negotiate with the Soviet Union -- how

together we could move gradually and safely toward defensive systems which would threaten no one.

We discussed threats to the peace in several regions of the world. I explained my proposals for a peace process to stop the wars in Afghanistan, Nicaragua, Ethiopia, Angola, and Cambodia, where insurgencies that speak for the people are pitted against regimes supported, sustained, or imposed by the Soviet Union. I tried to be very clear about where our sympathies lie; I believe I succeeded.

We discussed human rights. We Americans believe that history teaches no clearer lesson than this: Those countries which respect the rights of their own people tend, inevitably, to respect the rights of their neighbors. Human rights, therefore, is not an abstract moral issue -- it is a peace issue.

Finally, we discussed the barriers to communication between our societies, and I elaborated on our proposals for real people-to-people contacts on a wide scale.

I urged Mr. Gorbachev to join us in efforts to break down the barriers that keep our people estranged. Americans should know the people of the Soviet Union -- their hopes and fears and the facts of their lives. And citizens of the Soviet Union need to know of America's deep desire for peace and our unwavering attachment to freedom.

And so, you see, our talks were wide ranging. Let me at this point tell you what we agreed upon and what we didn't.

We remain far apart on many issues, as had to be expected. We reached agreement on a number of matters, however, and, as I

mentioned, we agreed to meet again. This is good: as a former union leader I can tell you there's always room for movement, action, and progress when people are talking.

We have concluded a new agreement designed to bring the best of America's artists and academics to the Soviet Union. The exhibits that will be included in this exchange are one of the most effective ways for the average Soviet citizen to learn about the American way of life. This agreement will also expand the opportunities for Americans to experience the Soviet people's rich cultural heritage.

We have also decided to go forward with a number of people-to-people initiatives that will provide greater contact not only between the political leaders of our two countries but our respective students, teachers, and others as well. This will help break down stereotypes, build friendships, and, frankly, provide an alternative to propaganda.

We have agreed to establish a new Soviet Consulate in New York and a new U.S. Consulate in Kiev. This will bring an official American presence to the Ukraine for the first time in decades.

We have also, together with the government of Japan, concluded a Pacific Air Safety Agreement with the Soviet Union. This is designed to set up cooperative measures to improve civil air safety in that region. What happened before must never be allowed to happen again.

As a way of dealing with the energy needs of the world of the future, we have also agreed with the Soviets to invite other

nations to join us in an international effort to explore the feasibility of developing fusion energy.

All of these steps are part of a long-term effort to build a more stable relationship with the Soviet Union. No one ever said it would be easy. But we've come a long way.

As for Soviet interference in many regions of the world -- I am afraid that there is no evidence of change. Let me be frank: We cannot hope for an early end to the Soviet occupation of Afghanistan. But we can support the heroic efforts of all those who fight for freedom -- and this we shall do. But we have also agreed to continue -- and, if possible, to intensify -- our meetings with the Soviets on this and other regional conflicts and to work toward political solutions.

We know the limits as well as the promise of summit meetings. This is, after all, the eleventh summit of the post-war era -- and still the differences endure. But we believe continued meetings between the leaders of the United States and the Soviet Union can help bridge those differences.

The fact is, every new day begins with possibilities; each new day is empty of history; it's up to us to fill it with the things that move us toward progress and peace. Hope, therefore, is a realistic attitude -- and despair an uninteresting little vice.

And so: was our journey worthwhile?

Thirty years ago, when he too had just returned from a summit in Geneva, President Eisenhower said, "...the wide gulf that separates so far East and West... (is) as wide and deep...

as the gulf that lies between the concept of man made in the image of his God and the concept of man as a mere instrument of the state." Today, three decades later, that is still true.

And yet I truly believe that this meeting was worthwhile for both sides. A new realism spawned the summit; the summit itself was a good start; and now our byword must be: Steady as we go.

I am, as you are, impatient for results. But goodwill and good hopes do not always yield lasting results. Quick fixes don't fix big problems.

Just as we must avoid illusions on our side, so we must dispel them on the Soviet side. I have made it clear to Mr. Gorbachev that there will be no Soviet gains from delay. Meetings like ours help to dispel Soviet illusions about the resolve of the West. And that too is good.

Where do we go from here? Well, our desire for improved relations is strong. We're ready and eager for step-by-step progress. We know that peace is not just the absence of war. We don't want a phony peace or a frail peace; we did not go in pursuit of some kind of make-believe detente. We can't be satisfied with cosmetic improvements that won't stand the test of time. We want real peace.

As I flew back this evening, I had many thoughts. In just a few days families across America will gather to celebrate Thanksgiving. And again, as our forefathers who voyaged to America, we travelled to Geneva with peace as our goal and freedom as our guide. For there can be no greater good than the

quest for peace -- nor no finer purpose than the preservation of freedom.

It is 350 years since the first Thanksgiving, when Pilgrims and Indians huddled together on the edge of an unknown continent. And now here we are gathered together on the edge of an unknown future -- but, like our forefathers, really not so much afraid, and full of hope, and trusting in God, as ever.

Thank you for allowing me to talk to you this evening. And God bless you all.

UNCLAS

CLASSIFICATION

CIRCLE ONE BELOW

IMMEDIATE

PRIORITY

ROUTINE

MODE

SECURE FAX

ADMIN FAX #

RECORD #

PAGES

DTG

RELEASER

9

211342

FROM/LOCATION

1. KIM TIMMONS - GENOVA

TO/LOCATION/TIME OF RECEIPT

1. KIM WHITE OEOB 111h

for 211340Z

INFORMATION ADDRESSEES/LOCATION/TIME OF RECEIPT

SPECIAL INSTRUCTIONS/REMARKS:

15 OCT 21 A 8:5

CLASSIFICATION

KIM WHITE
RESEARCH
11142

Thursday
2¹⁰pm Geneva

Kim:

Here's my sourced copy for
the joint session tonite.

It may prove completely
useless. As you will soon find
out this entire speech was
rewritten this early a.m. by
Matlock, McFarlane, Buchanan,
Thomas, etc. I was there but
they were making new policy.

In a nutshell, I think
this is completely out of our
hands... but just in case.

Call me w/ any questions!

Kim Timmons

SOURCED COPY
#1

KIM TIMMONS

(Noonan/BE)

November 18, 1985

4:00 p.m. (Geneva)

PRESIDENTIAL ADDRESS: JOINT SESSION OF THE CONGRESS
REPORT ON GENEVA
THURSDAY, NOVEMBER 21, 1985

Thank you ladies and gentlemen.

Mr. Speaker, Mr. President, Members of the Congress,
distinguished guests, my fellow Americans:

It's good to be home. Nancy and I thank you for this
wonderful homecoming. This great chamber has always greeted us
with kindness but after the bracing winds of Lake Geneva your
warmth is especially appreciated.

I have just come from Geneva; I am here to report to you and
to the American people on the summit and on my discussions with
General Secretary Gorbachev. I want to speak of what we
discussed -- what we agreed on -- what we were not able to agree
on -- whether it was worthwhile to make such a journey -- and
where we go from here.

To begin with, I am glad we made the journey. It was good
to talk with Mr. Gorbachev. I can say of our meetings that there
was "...no discourtesy, no loss of tempers, no threats or
ultimatums by either side; no advantage or concession gained or
given; no major decision...planned or taken; no spectacular
progress achieved or pretended." You may find those words
vaguely familiar. They're the words John Kennedy used to
describe his meetings with Khrushchev in Vienna. So not too much
has changed.

TITLE TO
GEN. SEC.
D.O.S.
BACKSEAT

TV
ADDRESS
TO
AMERICAN
PEOPLE
A THOUSAN
DAYS
SCHLESINGER
P. 377

JFK
PRES. DOC
6/6/61
RADIO +
TV
REPORT
1127

I found Mr. Gorbachev to be able, aggressive, assertive, and assured. He was quite a talker. I hope he was quite a listener too.

Our subject matter was shaped by the facts of this century. For 40 years the actions of the leaders of the Soviet Union have complicated our hopes for peace and for the growth of freedom.

These past 40 years have not been an easy time for the West or the world. You know these facts; there is no need to recite the historical record. Suffice it to say that the United States cannot afford illusions about the nature of the U.S.S.R. or the intentions of its leaders. But it is equally obvious that our differences must remain peaceful. With all that divides us, we cannot afford to let confusion complicate things further. We have a responsibility to be clear with each other, and direct. We must pay each other the tribute of candor.

Five years ago, when I took the oath of office for the first time, we began dealing with the Soviets in a way that was, we believed, more realistic than in the recent past. One aspect of the new realism was to continue the tradition observed by Thomas Jefferson: to "...confide in our strength without boasting of it; ^{...}^ (and) respect ^{...}^ (the strength of) others without fearing it."

I believe that, with your support, the policies this Nation has developed and followed the past 5 years have given us new strength to thwart aggression and subversion. America can say today: We are strong -- and our strength has given us the ability to speak with confidence and see that no true opportunity to advance freedom and peace is lost.

1/4/81
PRES-D
1-1

THE
JEFFER
SON
ENCYCLOP
EDIA
MICHAEL
SHOR

IV, 17,
FORD EI
VI, 338
(Pa. 1793

That is the history behind the Geneva summit, that is the context of the drama. And may I add that we were especially eager that our meetings might give a push to important talks already under way on nuclear weapons. This is an area of such great importance that it would be foolish not to go the extra mile -- or in this case the extra 4,000 miles.

We discussed the great issues of our time. I made clear before the first meeting that no question would be swept aside, no issue buried, just because one side found it too uncomfortable or inconvenient to face.

In recent years, the American people have questioned not only Soviet nuclear policies but their compliance with past agreements. We have had questions about expansionism by force in the Third World -- and failures to live up to human rights obligations -- and the obstacles to free and open communication between our peoples.

I brought those questions to the summit and I put them before Mr. Gorbachev.

We discussed nuclear arms and how to control them. I explained our proposals for real, equitable, and verifiable reductions. I outlined my conviction that our proposals would make not just for a world that feels safer but that really is safer. I explained our research on the Strategic Defense Initiative. I told Mr. Gorbachev that S.D.I. is a defensive weapon that offers the hope of eventually freeing both our countries from the death-grip of the doctrine of Mutually Assured Destruction. I offered the possibility of eventual cooperation

4,200
STATUTE
MILES:
GENEVA
TO
WASH-
OK
TRAVEL
OFFICE
+
A.F.
PILOTS
ON
ADVANCE

with the Soviets on S.D.I. if such a breakthrough does, indeed, prove possible.

We discussed threats to the peace in several regions of the world. I explained my proposals for a three-level peace process to stop the wars in Afghanistan, Nicaragua, Ethiopia, Angola, and Cambodia, where democratic insurgencies are pitted against communist-controlled or communist-backed governments. I tried to be very clear about where our sympathies lie; I believe I succeeded. I believe Mr. Gorbachev no longer doubts, if he ever did, our commitment to freedom.

We discussed human rights -- a sensitive issue for the Soviets. I explained that we Americans not only believe that freedom is essential to a meaningful life -- we believe that human rights are inseparable from the issue of peace.

History teaches no clearer lesson than this: those countries which respect the rights of their own people tend, inevitably, to respect the rights of their neighbors; and those countries which abuse the human rights of their people prey on their neighbors and upset the peace of the world. Human rights is not an abstract moral issue -- it is a peace issue. And human rights is not a matter of "interference in internal matters" any more than a bridge support "interferes" with a bridge -- it's a part of the bridge, not just something that's standing in the way!

We discussed the barriers to communication between our societies, and I elaborated on our proposals for real people-to-people contacts on a wide scale. Such contacts really

can enhance understanding. Franklin Roosevelt once said he learned more in 5 minutes with a man than from any number of briefing books and letters. That was a very American thing to say.

I told Mr. Gorbachev there is no justification for keeping our people estranged. Americans have a right to know the people of Russia -- their hopes and fears and the facts of their lives. And citizens of the Soviet Union have a right to know of America's deep desire for peace and our unwavering attachment to freedom.

And so, you see, our talks were wide ranging. Let me at this point tell you what we agreed upon and what we didn't.

We remain far apart on many issues, as had to be expected. We reached agreement on certain matters, however, and, most significant, we agreed to meet again. This is good: as a former union leader I can tell you there's always room for movement, action, and progress when people are talking.

On arms control, the Soviets still have not met us half way. This is disappointing. But the pace of our arms negotiations has picked up and we've made some small progress. What's more, we've agreed to keep trying.

As for Soviet activities in the Third World -- I am afraid Mr. Gorbachev is content to allow these dangerous wars to fester and continue. He insists, as his predecessors have, that it is the historic duty of the Soviet Union to encourage wars of, quote, national liberation. He did not agree that the Soviet invasion of Afghanistan is not a matter of liberation but of

OK
FDR
ADDRESS
TO THE
CONGRES
#138
P. 570
3/1/45

SCREEN
ACTOR
GUILD
LABOR
UNION
ENCYC
OFF
ASSO
1964
VOL. I
1947-5
1952-6
P. 344
CURRE
BIO
128

conquest. Let me be frank: we cannot hope for an immediate or dramatic end to the Soviet occupation. But we can enlist our support for the true cause of freedom in Afghanistan -- and this we shall do. We have also agreed to continue our meetings with the Soviets on these regional issues.

On the issue of people-to-people contacts, there is progress to report. Mr. Gorbachev and I were able to come to agreement on (FILL IN THE FACTS). We look forward to implementing agreements on (AS APPROPRIATE.)

In addition, our discussions on civil aviation and air safety (ARE MAKING PROGRESS)/(HAVE PRODUCED AGREEMENTS) that will serve the interests of both our countries.

And finally, as you know, Mr. Gorbachev and I agreed to meet again next year in (AS APPROPRIATE).

We know the limits as well as the promise of summit meetings. And we believe the continued involvement of the leaders of the United States and the Soviet Union may well help move us forward over the years.

The fact is, every new day begins with possibilities; each new day is empty of history; it's up to us to fill it with the things that move us toward progress and peace. Hope, therefore, is a realistic attitude -- and despair an uninteresting little vice.

And so: was our journey worthwhile?

Thirty years ago, when he too had just returned from a summit in Geneva, President Eisenhower said, "...the wide gulf that separates ^{so far} East and West... (is) as wide and deep as the

RADIO &
TV ADDRESS
TO AMERICAN PEOPLE
ON THE
GENEVA
CONFERENCE
JULY 25, 1975

X

X difference between individual liberty and ~~repression~~ regimentation. -- as wide as the gap that lies between the two concepts of man made in the image of his God. And the concept of man as a new institution of the state. Today, and three decades later, that is still true.

And yet I truly believe that this meeting was worthwhile for both sides. A new realism spawned the summit; the summit itself was good; and now our byword must be: Steady as we go.

I am, as you are, impatient for results. But in spite of our goodwill and our good hopes we cannot always control events. We can, however, do all in our power to be persuasive for peace. And I have made it clear to Mr. Gorbachev that there will be no Soviet gains from delay.

Just as we must avoid illusions on our side, so we must dispel them on the Soviet side. Meetings like ours help to dispel Soviet illusions about the resolve of the West. And that too is good.

We face a new Soviet leadership. Its members face many big decisions at home and abroad. We cannot know whether this Soviet government will continue to resist their people's desire and their nation's need for change. We cannot know -- but because the choices they make will affect us, I thought it absolutely essential to tell the Soviet government personally where the United States stands. I think we gave the other side a lot to think about.

Where do we go from here? Well, our desire for improved relations is strong. We're ready and eager for step-by-step progress. We know that peace is not just the absence of war. Peace is sustained harmony among nations. Such harmony is difficult to achieve in discordant times, but it's the thing

truly worth pursuing. We don't want a phony peace or a frail peace; we did not go in pursuit of some kind of make-believe detente or era of new accords. We can't be satisfied with cosmetic improvements that won't stand the test of time. We want real peace, and we want it to last.

As I flew back this evening, I had many thoughts. In just a few days families across America will gather to celebrate Thanksgiving. It is 350 years since the first Thanksgiving, when Pilgrims and Indians held to each other on the edge of an unknown continent. And now we are moderns huddled on the edge of a future -- but, like our forefathers, really not so much afraid, and full of hope, and trusting in God, as ever.

Thank you for allowing me to talk to you this evening. And God bless you all.

FIRST
NATION
T-DAY
NOV. 26
1790
ENCYC.
AM. HIST.
EAGLE
BOOKS
BY L.A.
MJS

1621
autum
Encyc.
Am. p. 5
Vol. 26

*Joint PS
Joint TB
Joint* ~~House~~ Final w/
President's suggested technical
fixes.

(Noonan/BE)

November 21, 1985
12:30 p.m. (Geneva)

PRESIDENTIAL ADDRESS: JOINT SESSION OF THE CONGRESS
REPORT ON GENEVA
THURSDAY, NOVEMBER 21, 1985

Thank you ladies and gentlemen.

Mr. Speaker, Mr. President, Members of the Congress,
distinguished guests, my fellow Americans:

It's great to be home. Nancy and I thank you for this
wonderful homecoming. And before I go on I want to say a
personal thank you to Nancy. She was an outstanding ambassador
of good will for all of us. Thanks, partner.

Mr. Speaker, Senator Dole, I want you to know your
statements of support were and are greatly appreciated. You
can't imagine how much it means in dealing with the Soviets to
have the Congress, the allies, and the American people firmly
behind me.

As you know, I have just come from Geneva and talks with
General Secretary Gorbachev. In the past few days, we spent over
15 hours in various meetings with the General Secretary and the
members of his official party. Approximately 5 of those hours
were talks between Mr. Gorbachev and myself, one on one. That
was the best part -- Our fireside summit.

There will be, I know, a great deal of commentary and
opinion as to what the meetings produced and what they were like.
There were over 3,000 reporters in Geneva, so it's possible there
will be 3,000 opinions on what happened. Maybe it's the old
broadcaster in me but I decided to file my own report directly to
you.

We met, as we had to meet. I had called for a fresh start -- and we made that start. I can't claim we had a meeting of the minds on such fundamentals as ideology or national purpose -- but we understand each other better. That's key to peace. I gained a better perspective; I feel he did, too.

It was a constructive meeting. So constructive, in fact, ~~I look forward to welcoming Mr. Gorbachev to the~~ that ~~Mr. Gorbachev has accepted our invitation to visit the~~ United States next year. And I have accepted his invitation to go to Moscow the following year.

I found Mr. Gorbachev to be an energetic defender of Soviet policy. He was an eloquent speaker, and a good listener. Our subject matter was shaped by the facts of this century.

These past 40 years have not been an easy time for the West or the world. You know the facts; there is no need to recite the historical record. Suffice it to say that the United States cannot afford illusions about the nature of the U.S.S.R. We cannot assume that their ideology and purpose will change. This implies enduring competition. Our task is to assure that this competition remains peaceful. With all that divides us, we cannot afford to let confusion complicate things further. We must be clear with each other, and direct. We must pay each other the tribute of candor.

When I took the oath of office for the first time, we began dealing with the Soviet Union in a way that was more realistic than in the recent past. And so, in a very real sense, preparations for the summit started not months ago but 5 years ago when -- with the help of Congress -- we began strengthening

2 APR
certain
or can
manic
his 2
1985

our economy, restoring our national will, and rebuilding our defenses and alliances. America is once again strong -- and our strength has given us the ability to speak with confidence and see that no true opportunity to advance freedom and peace is lost. *§ We must not now abandon policies that work. I need your continued support to keep America strong. §*

That is the history behind the Geneva summit, that is the context in which it occurred. And may I add that we were especially eager that our meetings give a push to important talks already under way on reducing nuclear weapons. On this subject it would be foolish not to go the extra mile -- or in this case the extra 4,000 miles.

We discussed the great issues of our time. I made clear before the first meeting that no question would be swept aside, no issue buried, just because either side found it uncomfortable or inconvenient.

I brought these questions to the summit and put them before Mr. Gorbachev.

We discussed nuclear arms and how to reduce them. I explained our proposals for equitable, verifiable, and deep reductions. I outlined my conviction that our proposals would make not just for a world that feels safer but that really is safer.

I am pleased to report tonight that General Secretary Gorbachev and I did make a measure of progress here. While we still have a long ways to go, we're at least heading in the right direction. We moved arms control forward from where we were last January, when the Soviets returned to the table.

In our joint statement we called for early progress on this, turning the talks toward our chief goal, offensive reductions. We called for

We are both instructing our negotiators to hasten their vital work. The world is waiting for results.

Specifically, we agreed in Geneva that each side should move to cut offensive nuclear arms by 50 percent in appropriate categories, (and reach) an interim accord on intermediate-range (missiles,) leading, (we) hope, to the complete elimination of this class of missiles. All this with tough verification. *nuclear forces*

We also made progress in combatting together the spread of nuclear weapons, an arms control area in which we've cooperated *effectively* ~~nicely~~ over the years. We are also opening a dialogue on *And use of* combatting the spread of chemical weapons, while moving to ban them altogether. Other arms control dialogues -- in Vienna on conventional *forces* (arms), and in Stockholm on lessening the chances for surprise attack in Europe -- also received a boost. Finally, we agreed to begin work on risk reduction centers. *a decision that should give special satisfaction to Senators Nunn and Warner who so ably*

I described our Strategic Defense Initiative -- our research *promoted this idea* effort that envisions the possibility of defensive systems which could ultimately protect all nations against the danger of nuclear war. This discussion produced a very direct exchange of views.

Mr. Gorbachev insisted that we might use a strategic defense system to put offensive weapons into space and establish nuclear superiority.

I made it clear that S.D.I. has nothing to do with offensive weapons; that, instead, we are investigating non-nuclear defensive systems that would only threaten offensive missiles, not people. If our research succeeds, it will bring much closer

the safer, more stable world we seek. Nations could defend themselves against missile attack, and mankind, at long last, escape the prison of mutual terror -- this is my dream.

So I welcomed the chance to tell Mr. Gorbachev that we are a Nation that defends, rather than attacks, that our alliances are defensive, not offensive. We don't seek nuclear superiority. We do not seek a first strike advantage over the Soviet Union. Indeed, one of my fundamental arms control objectives is to get rid of first strike weapons altogether. This is why we have proposed a 50-percent reduction in the most threatening nuclear weapons, especially those that could carry out a first strike.

I went further in expressing our peaceful intentions. I described our proposal in the Geneva negotiations for a ^{reciprocal} program of open laboratories in strategic defense research. We are offering to permit Soviet experts to see first hand that S.D.I. does not involve offensive weapons. American scientists would be allowed to visit comparable facilities of the Soviet strategic defense program, which, in fact, has involved much more than research for many years.

Finally, I reassured Mr. Gorbachev on another point. I promised that if our research reveals that a defense against nuclear missiles is possible, we would sit down with our allies and the Soviet Union to see how together we could replace all ~~nuclear~~ ^{ballistic} ~~missiles~~ ^{strategic} with such a defense, which threatens no one.

We discussed threats to the peace in several regions of the world. I explained my proposals for a peace process to stop the wars in Afghanistan, Nicaragua, Ethiopia, Angola, and Cambodia,

where insurgencies that speak for the people are pitted against regimes which obviously do not represent the will or the approval of the people. I tried to be very clear about where our sympathies lie; I believe I succeeded.

We discussed human rights. We Americans believe that history teaches no clearer lesson than this: Those countries which respect the rights of their own people tend, inevitably, to respect the rights of their neighbors. Human rights, therefore, is not an abstract moral issue -- it is a peace issue.

Finally, we discussed the barriers to communication between our societies, and I elaborated on ^{my}~~our~~ proposals for real people-to-people contacts on a wide scale.

Americans should know the people of the Soviet Union -- their hopes and fears and the facts of their lives. And citizens of the Soviet Union need to know of America's deep desire for peace and our unwavering attachment to freedom.

As you can see, our talks were wide ranging. Let me at this point tell you what we agreed upon and what we didn't.

We remain far apart on a number of issues, as had to be expected. However, we reached agreement on a number of matters, and, as I mentioned, we agreed to continue meeting and this is important and very good. There's always room for movement, action, and progress when people are talking to each other instead of about each other.

We have concluded a new agreement designed to bring the best of America's artists and academics to the Soviet Union. The exhibits that will be included in this exchange are one of the

most effective ways for the average Soviet citizen to learn about our way of life. This agreement will also expand the opportunities for Americans to experience the Soviet people's rich cultural heritage -- because their artists and academics will be coming here.

We have also decided to go forward with a number of people-to-people initiatives that will ^{go beyond} (provide) greater ^{have} contact not only between the political leaders of our two countries but ^{We have emphasized youth} our respective students, teachers, and others as well. ^{exchanges.} This will help break down stereotypes, build friendships, and, frankly, provide an alternative to propaganda.

We have agreed to establish a new Soviet Consulate in New York and a new ^{American} (U.S.) Consulate in Kiev. This will bring a ^{permanent} ~~(official)~~ ^{U.S.} ~~(American)~~ presence to the Ukraine for the first time in decades.

We have also, together with the government of Japan, concluded a Pacific Air Safety Agreement with the Soviet Union. This is designed to set up cooperative measures to improve civil air safety in that region. What happened before must never be allowed to happen again.

As a ^{potential} way of dealing with the energy needs of the world of the future, we have also ^{Advocated international communication} ~~(agreed with the Soviets to invite other nations to join us in an)~~ ^{cooperation} international ~~(effort)~~ to explore the feasibility of developing fusion energy.

All of these steps are part of a long-term effort to build a more stable relationship with the Soviet Union. No one ever said it would be easy. But we've come a long way.

As for Soviet expansionism in a number of regions of the world -- while there is little chance of immediate change, we will continue to support the heroic efforts of those who fight for freedom. But we have also agreed to continue -- and to intensify -- our meetings with the Soviets on this and other regional conflicts and to work toward political solutions.

We know the limits as well as the promise of summit meetings. This is, after all, the eleventh summit of the post-war era -- and still the differences endure. But we believe continued meetings between the leaders of the United States and the Soviet Union can help bridge those differences.

The fact is, every new day begins with possibilities; ~~each new day is empty of history~~ it's up to us to fill it with the things that move us toward progress and peace. Hope, therefore, is a realistic attitude -- and despair an uninteresting little vice.

And so: was our journey worthwhile?

Thirty years ago, when he too had just returned from a summit in Geneva, President Eisenhower said, "the wide gulf that separates so far East and West... (is)... wide and deep." Today, three decades later, that is still true.

But, yes, this meeting was worthwhile for both sides. A new realism spawned the summit; the summit itself was a good start; and now our byword must be: Steady as we go.

I am, as you are, impatient for results. But goodwill and good hopes do not always yield lasting results. Quick fixes don't fix big problems.

Just as we must avoid illusions on our side, so we must dispel them on the Soviet side. I have made it clear to Mr. Gorbachev that we must reduce the mistrust and suspicions between us if we are to do such things as reduce arms, and this will take deeds, not words alone. I believe he is in agreement.

Where do we go from here? Well, our desire for improved relations is strong. We're ready and eager for step-by-step progress. We know that peace is not just the absence of war. We don't want a phony peace or a frail peace; we did not go in pursuit of some kind of ~~make-believe~~ ^{illusory} detente. We can't be satisfied with cosmetic improvements that won't stand the test of time. We want real peace.

As I flew back this evening, I had many thoughts. In just a few days families across America will gather to celebrate Thanksgiving. And again, as our forefathers who voyaged to America, we travelled to Geneva with peace as our goal and freedom as our guide. For there can be no greater good than the quest for peace -- nor no finer purpose than the preservation of freedom.

It is 350 years since the first Thanksgiving, when Pilgrims and Indians huddled together on the edge of an unknown continent. And now here we are gathered together on the edge of an unknown future -- but, like our forefathers, really not so much afraid, ^{but} (and) full of hope, and trusting in God, as ever.

Thank you for allowing me to talk to you this evening. And God bless you all.

(Noonan/BE)
November 21, 1985
12:30 p.m. (Geneva)

PRESIDENTIAL ADDRESS: JOINT SESSION OF THE CONGRESS
REPORT ON GENEVA
THURSDAY, NOVEMBER 21, 1985

Thank you ladies and gentlemen.

Mr. Speaker, Mr. President, Members of the Congress,
distinguished guests, my fellow Americans:

It's great to be home. Nancy and I thank you for this wonderful homecoming. And before I go on I want to say a personal thank you to Nancy. She was an outstanding ambassador of good will for all of us. Thanks, partner.

Mr. Speaker, Senator Dole, I want you to know your statements of support were and are greatly appreciated. You can't imagine how much it means in dealing with the Soviets to have the Congress, the allies, and the American people firmly behind me.

As you know, I have just come from Geneva and talks with General Secretary Gorbachev. In the past few days, we spent over 15 hours in various meetings with the General Secretary and the members of his official party. Approximately 5 of those hours were talks between Mr. Gorbachev and myself, one on one. That was the best part -- Our fireside summit.

There will be, I know, a great deal of commentary and opinion as to what the meetings produced and what they were like. There were over 3,000 reporters in Geneva, so it's possible there will be 3,000 opinions on what happened. Maybe it's the old broadcaster in me but I decided to file my own report directly to you.

We met, as we had to meet. I had called for a fresh start -- and we made that start. I can't claim we had a meeting of the minds on such fundamentals as ideology or national purpose -- but we understand each other better. That's key to peace. I gained a better perspective; I feel he did, too.

It was a constructive meeting. So constructive, in fact, that Mr. Gorbachev has accepted our invitation to visit the United States next year. And I have accepted his invitation to go to Moscow the following year.

I found Mr. Gorbachev to be an energetic defender of Soviet policy. He was an eloquent speaker, and a good listener. Our subject matter was shaped by the facts of this century.

These past 40 years have not been an easy time for the West or the world. You know the facts; there is no need to recite the historical record. Suffice it to say that the United States cannot afford illusions about the nature of the U.S.S.R. We cannot assume that their ideology and purpose will change. This implies enduring competition. Our task is to assure that this competition remains peaceful. With all that divides us, we cannot afford to let confusion complicate things further. We must be clear with each other, and direct. We must pay each other the tribute of candor.

When I took the oath of office for the first time, we began dealing with the Soviet Union in a way that was more realistic than in the recent past. And so, in a very real sense, preparations for the summit started not months ago but 5 years ago when -- with the help of Congress -- we began strengthening

our economy, restoring our national will, and rebuilding our defenses and alliances. America is once again strong -- and our strength has given us the ability to speak with confidence and see that no true opportunity to advance freedom and peace is lost.

That is the history behind the Geneva summit, that is the context in which it occurred. And may I add that we were especially eager that our meetings give a push to important talks already under way on reducing nuclear weapons. On this subject it would be foolish not to go the extra mile -- or in this case the extra 4,000 miles.

We discussed the great issues of our time. I made clear before the first meeting that no question would be swept aside, no issue buried, just because either side found it uncomfortable or inconvenient.

I brought these questions to the summit and put them before Mr. Gorbachev.

We discussed nuclear arms and how to reduce them. I explained our proposals for equitable, verifiable, and deep reductions. I outlined my conviction that our proposals would make not just for a world that feels safer but that really is safer.

I am pleased to report tonight that General Secretary Gorbachev and I did make a measure of progress here. While we still have a long ways to go, we're at least heading in the right direction. We moved arms control forward from where we were last January, when the Soviets returned to the table.

We are both instructing our negotiators to hasten their vital work. The world is waiting for results.

Specifically, we agreed in Geneva that each side should move to cut offensive nuclear arms by 50 percent in appropriate categories, and reach an interim accord on intermediate-range missiles, leading, we hope, to the complete elimination of this class of missiles. All this with tough verification.

We also made progress in combatting together the spread of nuclear weapons, an arms control area in which we've cooperated nicely over the years. We are also opening a dialogue on combatting the spread of chemical weapons, while moving to ban them altogether. Other arms control dialogues -- in Vienna on conventional arms, and in Stockholm on lessening the chances for surprise attack in Europe -- also received a boost. Finally, we agreed to begin work on risk reduction centers.

I described our Strategic Defense Initiative -- our research effort that envisions the possibility of defensive systems which could ultimately protect all nations against the danger of nuclear war. This discussion produced a very direct exchange of views.

Mr. Gorbachev insisted that we might use a strategic defense system to put offensive weapons into space and establish nuclear superiority.

I made it clear that S.D.I. has nothing to do with offensive weapons; that, instead, we are investigating non-nuclear defensive systems that would only threaten offensive missiles, not people. If our research succeeds, it will bring much closer

the safer, more stable world we seek. Nations could defend themselves against missile attack, and mankind at long last escape the prison of mutual terror -- this is my dream.

So I welcomed the chance to tell Mr. Gorbachev that we are a Nation that defends, rather than attacks, that our alliances are defensive, not offensive. We don't seek nuclear superiority. We do not seek a first strike advantage over the Soviet Union. Indeed, one of my fundamental arms control objectives is to get rid of first strike weapons altogether. This is why we have proposed a 50-percent reduction in the most threatening nuclear weapons, especially those that could carry out a first strike.

I went further in expressing our peaceful intentions. I described our proposal in the Geneva negotiations for a program of open laboratories in strategic defense research. We are offering to permit Soviet experts to see first hand that S.D.I. does not involve offensive weapons. American scientists would be allowed to visit comparable facilities of the Soviet strategic defense program, which, in fact, has involved much more than research for many years.

Finally, I reassured Mr. Gorbachev on another point. I promised that if our research reveals that a defense against nuclear missiles is possible, we would sit down with our allies and the Soviet Union to see how together we could replace all nuclear missiles with such a defense, which threatens no one.

We discussed threats to the peace in several regions of the world. I explained my proposals for a peace process to stop the wars in Afghanistan, Nicaragua, Ethiopia, Angola, and Cambodia,

where insurgencies that speak for the people are pitted against regimes which obviously do not represent the will or the approval of the people. I tried to be very clear about where our sympathies lie; I believe I succeeded.

We discussed human rights. We Americans believe that history teaches no clearer lesson than this: Those countries which respect the rights of their own people tend, inevitably, to respect the rights of their neighbors. Human rights, therefore, is not an abstract moral issue -- it is a peace issue.

Finally, we discussed the barriers to communication between our societies, and I elaborated on our proposals for real people-to-people contacts on a wide scale.

Americans should know the people of the Soviet Union -- their hopes and fears and the facts of their lives. And citizens of the Soviet Union need to know of America's deep desire for peace and our unwavering attachment to freedom.

As you can see, our talks were wide ranging. Let me at this point tell you what we agreed upon and what we didn't.

We remain far apart on a number of issues, as had to be expected. However, we reached agreement on a number of matters, and, as I mentioned, we agreed to continue meeting and this is important and very good. There's always room for movement, action, and progress when people are talking to each other instead of about each other.

We have concluded a new agreement designed to bring the best of America's artists and academics to the Soviet Union. The exhibits that will be included in this exchange are one of the

most effective ways for the average Soviet citizen to learn about our way of life. This agreement will also expand the opportunities for Americans to experience the Soviet people's rich cultural heritage -- because their artists and academics will be coming here.

We have also decided to go forward with a number of people-to-people initiatives that will provide greater contact not only between the political leaders of our two countries but our respective students, teachers, and others as well. This will help break down stereotypes, build friendships, and, frankly, provide an alternative to propaganda.

We have agreed to establish a new Soviet Consulate in New York and a new U.S. Consulate in Kiev. This will bring an official American presence to the Ukraine for the first time in decades.

We have also, together with the government of Japan, concluded a Pacific Air Safety Agreement with the Soviet Union. This is designed to set up cooperative measures to improve civil air safety in that region. What happened before must never be allowed to happen again.

As a way of dealing with the energy needs of the world of the future, we have also agreed with the Soviets to invite other nations to join us in an international effort to explore the feasibility of developing fusion energy.

All of these steps are part of a long-term effort to build a more stable relationship with the Soviet Union. No one ever said it would be easy. But we've come a long way.

As for Soviet expansionism in a number of regions of the world -- while there is little chance of immediate change, we will continue to support the heroic efforts of those who fight for freedom. But we have also agreed to continue -- and to intensify -- our meetings with the Soviets on this and other regional conflicts and to work toward political solutions.

We know the limits as well as the promise of summit meetings. This is, after all, the eleventh summit of the post-war era -- and still the differences endure. But we believe continued meetings between the leaders of the United States and the Soviet Union can help bridge those differences.

The fact is, every new day begins with possibilities; each new day is empty of history; it's up to us to fill it with the things that move us toward progress and peace. Hope, therefore, is a realistic attitude -- and despair an uninteresting little vice.

And so: was our journey worthwhile?

Thirty years ago, when he too had just returned from a summit in Geneva, President Eisenhower said, "...the wide gulf that separates so far East and West... (is)... wide and deep." Today, three decades later, that is still true.

But, yes, this meeting was worthwhile for both sides. A new realism spawned the summit; the summit itself was a good start; and now our byword must be: Steady as we go.

I am, as you are, impatient for results. But goodwill and good hopes do not always yield lasting results. Quick fixes don't fix big problems.

Just as we must avoid illusions on our side, so we must dispel them on the Soviet side. I have made it clear to Mr. Gorbachev that we must reduce the mistrust and suspicions between us if we are to do such things as reduce arms, and this will take deeds, not words alone. I believe he is in agreement.

Where do we go from here? Well, our desire for improved relations is strong. We're ready and eager for step-by-step progress. We know that peace is not just the absence of war. We don't want a phony peace or a frail peace; we did not go in pursuit of some kind of make-believe detente. We can't be satisfied with cosmetic improvements that won't stand the test of time. We want real peace.

As I flew back this evening, I had many thoughts. In just a few days families across America will gather to celebrate Thanksgiving. And again, as our forefathers who voyaged to America, we travelled to Geneva with peace as our goal and freedom as our guide. For there can be no greater good than the quest for peace -- nor no finer purpose than the preservation of freedom.

It is 350 years since the first Thanksgiving, when Pilgrims and Indians huddled together on the edge of an unknown continent. And now here we are gathered together on the edge of an unknown future -- but, like our forefathers, really not so much afraid, and full of hope, and trusting in God, as ever.

Thank you for allowing me to talk to you this evening. And God bless you all.

(Noonan/BE)

November 21, 1985
12:30 p.m. (Geneva)

PRESIDENTIAL ADDRESS: JOINT SESSION OF THE CONGRESS
REPORT ON GENEVA
THURSDAY, NOVEMBER 21, 1985

Thank you ladies and gentlemen.

Mr. Speaker, Mr. President, Members of the Congress,
distinguished guests, my fellow Americans:

It's great to be home. Nancy and I thank you for this wonderful homecoming. And before I go on I want to say a personal thank you to Nancy. She was an outstanding ambassador of good will for all of us. Thanks, partner.

Mr. Speaker, Senator Dole, I want you to know your statements of support were and are greatly appreciated. You can't imagine how much it means in dealing with the Soviets to have the Congress, the allies, and the American people firmly behind me.

As you know, I have just come from Geneva and talks with General Secretary Gorbachev. In the past few days, we spent over 15 hours in various meetings with the General Secretary and the members of his official party. Approximately 5 of those hours were talks between Mr. Gorbachev and myself, one on one. That was the best part -- Our fireside summit.

There will be, I know, a great deal of commentary and opinion as to what the meetings produced and what they were like. There were over 3,000 reporters in Geneva, so it's possible there will be 3,000 opinions on what happened. Maybe it's the old broadcaster in me but I decided to file my own report directly to you.

We met, as we had to meet. I had called for a fresh start -- and we made that start. I can't claim we had a meeting of the minds on such fundamentals as ideology or national purpose -- but we understand each other better. That's key to peace. I gained a better perspective; I feel he did, too.

It was a constructive meeting. So constructive, in fact, that Mr. Gorbachev has accepted our invitation to visit the United States next year. And I have accepted his invitation to go to Moscow the following year.

I found Mr. Gorbachev to be an energetic defender of Soviet policy. He was an eloquent speaker, and a good listener. Our subject matter was shaped by the facts of this century.

These past 40 years have not been an easy time for the West or the world. You know the facts; there is no need to recite the historical record. Suffice it to say that the United States cannot afford illusions about the nature of the U.S.S.R. We cannot assume that their ideology and purpose will change. This implies enduring competition. Our task is to assure that this competition remains peaceful. With all that divides us, we cannot afford to let confusion complicate things further. We must be clear with each other, and direct. We must pay each other the tribute of candor.

When I took the oath of office for the first time, we began dealing with the Soviet Union in a way that was more realistic than in the recent past. And so, in a very real sense, preparations for the summit started not months ago but 5 years ago when -- with the help of Congress -- we began strengthening

our economy, restoring our national will, and rebuilding our defenses and alliances. America is once again strong -- and our strength has given us the ability to speak with confidence and see that no true opportunity to advance freedom and peace is lost.

That is the history behind the Geneva summit, that is the context in which it occurred. And may I add that we were especially eager that our meetings give a push to important talks already under way on reducing nuclear weapons. On this subject it would be foolish not to go the extra mile -- or in this case the extra 4,000 miles.

We discussed the great issues of our time. I made clear before the first meeting that no question would be swept aside, no issue buried, just because either side found it uncomfortable or inconvenient.

I brought these questions to the summit and put them before Mr. Gorbachev.

We discussed nuclear arms and how to reduce them. I explained our proposals for equitable, verifiable, and deep reductions. I outlined my conviction that our proposals would make not just for a world that feels safer but that really is safer.

I am pleased to report tonight that General Secretary Gorbachev and I did make a measure of progress here. While we still have a long ways to go, we're at least heading in the right direction. We moved arms control forward from where we were last January, when the Soviets returned to the table.

We are both instructing our negotiators to hasten their vital work. The world is waiting for results.

Specifically, we agreed in Geneva that each side should move to cut offensive nuclear arms by 50 percent in appropriate categories, and reach an interim accord on intermediate-range missiles, leading, we hope, to the complete elimination of this class of missiles. All this with tough verification.

We also made progress in combatting together the spread of nuclear weapons, an arms control area in which we've cooperated nicely over the years. We are also opening a dialogue on combatting the spread of chemical weapons, while moving to ban them altogether. Other arms control dialogues -- in Vienna on conventional arms, and in Stockholm on lessening the chances for surprise attack in Europe -- also received a boost. Finally, we agreed to begin work on risk reduction centers.

I described our Strategic Defense Initiative -- our research effort that envisions the possibility of defensive systems which could ultimately protect all nations against the danger of nuclear war. This discussion produced a very direct exchange of views.

Mr. Gorbachev insisted that we might use a strategic defense system to put offensive weapons into space and establish nuclear superiority.

I made it clear that S.D.I. has nothing to do with offensive weapons; that, instead, we are investigating non-nuclear defensive systems that would only threaten offensive missiles, not people. If our research succeeds, it will bring much closer

the safer, more stable world we seek. Nations could defend themselves against missile attack, and mankind at long last escape the prison of mutual terror -- this is my dream.

So I welcomed the chance to tell Mr. Gorbachev that we are a Nation that defends, rather than attacks, that our alliances are defensive, not offensive. We don't seek nuclear superiority. We do not seek a first strike advantage over the Soviet Union. Indeed, one of my fundamental arms control objectives is to get rid of first strike weapons altogether. This is why we have proposed a 50-percent reduction in the most threatening nuclear weapons, especially those that could carry out a first strike.

I went further in expressing our peaceful intentions. I described our proposal in the Geneva negotiations for a program of open laboratories in strategic defense research. We are offering to permit Soviet experts to see first hand that S.D.I. does not involve offensive weapons. American scientists would be allowed to visit comparable facilities of the Soviet strategic defense program, which, in fact, has involved much more than research for many years.

Finally, I reassured Mr. Gorbachev on another point. I promised that if our research reveals that a defense against nuclear missiles is possible, we would sit down with our allies and the Soviet Union to see how together we could replace all nuclear missiles with such a defense, which threatens no one.

We discussed threats to the peace in several regions of the world. I explained my proposals for a peace process to stop the wars in Afghanistan, Nicaragua, Ethiopia, Angola, and Cambodia,

where insurgencies that speak for the people are pitted against regimes which obviously do not represent the will or the approval of the people. I tried to be very clear about where our sympathies lie; I believe I succeeded.

We discussed human rights. We Americans believe that history teaches no clearer lesson than this: Those countries which respect the rights of their own people tend, inevitably, to respect the rights of their neighbors. Human rights, therefore, is not an abstract moral issue -- it is a peace issue.

Finally, we discussed the barriers to communication between our societies, and I elaborated on our proposals for real people-to-people contacts on a wide scale.

Americans should know the people of the Soviet Union -- their hopes and fears and the facts of their lives. And citizens of the Soviet Union need to know of America's deep desire for peace and our unwavering attachment to freedom.

As you can see, our talks were wide ranging. Let me at this point tell you what we agreed upon and what we didn't.

We remain far apart on a number of issues, as had to be expected. However, we reached agreement on a number of matters, and, as I mentioned, we agreed to continue meeting and this is important and very good. There's always room for movement, action, and progress when people are talking to each other instead of about each other.

We have concluded a new agreement designed to bring the best of America's artists and academics to the Soviet Union. The exhibits that will be included in this exchange are one of the

most effective ways for the average Soviet citizen to learn about our way of life. This agreement will also expand the opportunities for Americans to experience the Soviet people's rich cultural heritage -- because their artists and academics will be coming here.

We have also decided to go forward with a number of people-to-people initiatives that will provide greater contact not only between the political leaders of our two countries but our respective students, teachers, and others as well. This will help break down stereotypes, build friendships, and, frankly, provide an alternative to propaganda.

We have agreed to establish a new Soviet Consulate in New York and a new U.S. Consulate in Kiev. This will bring an official American presence to the Ukraine for the first time in decades.

We have also, together with the government of Japan, concluded a Pacific Air Safety Agreement with the Soviet Union. This is designed to set up cooperative measures to improve civil air safety in that region. What happened before must never be allowed to happen again.

As a way of dealing with the energy needs of the world of the future, we have also agreed with the Soviets to invite other nations to join us in an international effort to explore the feasibility of developing fusion energy.

All of these steps are part of a long-term effort to build a more stable relationship with the Soviet Union. No one ever said it would be easy. But we've come a long way.

As for Soviet expansionism in a number of regions of the world -- while there is little chance of immediate change, we will continue to support the heroic efforts of those who fight for freedom. But we have also agreed to continue -- and to intensify -- our meetings with the Soviets on this and other regional conflicts and to work toward political solutions.

We know the limits as well as the promise of summit meetings. This is, after all, the eleventh summit of the post-war era -- and still the differences endure. But we believe continued meetings between the leaders of the United States and the Soviet Union can help bridge those differences.

The fact is, every new day begins with possibilities; each new day is empty of history; it's up to us to fill it with the things that move us toward progress and peace. Hope, therefore, is a realistic attitude -- and despair an uninteresting little vice.

And so: was our journey worthwhile?

Thirty years ago, when he too had just returned from a summit in Geneva, President Eisenhower said, "...the wide gulf that separates so far East and West... (is)... wide and deep." Today, three decades later, that is still true.

But, yes, this meeting was worthwhile for both sides. A new realism spawned the summit; the summit itself was a good start; and now our byword must be: Steady as we go.

I am, as you are, impatient for results. But goodwill and good hopes do not always yield lasting results. Quick fixes don't fix big problems.

Just as we must avoid illusions on our side, so we must dispel them on the Soviet side. I have made it clear to Mr. Gorbachev that we must reduce the mistrust and suspicions between us if we are to do such things as reduce arms, and this will take deeds, not words alone. I believe he is in agreement.

Where do we go from here? Well, our desire for improved relations is strong. We're ready and eager for step-by-step progress. We know that peace is not just the absence of war. We don't want a phony peace or a frail peace; we did not go in pursuit of some kind of make-believe detente. We can't be satisfied with cosmetic improvements that won't stand the test of time. We want real peace.

As I flew back this evening, I had many thoughts. In just a few days families across America will gather to celebrate Thanksgiving. And again, as our forefathers who voyaged to America, we travelled to Geneva with peace as our goal and freedom as our guide. For there can be no greater good than the quest for peace -- nor no finer purpose than the preservation of freedom.

It is 350 years since the first Thanksgiving, when Pilgrims and Indians huddled together on the edge of an unknown continent. And now here we are gathered together on the edge of an unknown future -- but, like our forefathers, really not so much afraid, and full of hope, and trusting in God, as ever.

Thank you for allowing me to talk to you this evening. And God bless you all.