

# 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 (3)

**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](mailto:reagan.library@nara.gov)

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

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

(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. *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 ~~at least~~ 3,000 opinions on what happened. Maybe it's the old broadcaster in me but I ~~thought 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.

~~In short, it~~ was a constructive meeting. So constructive, in fact, that Mr. Gorbachev <sup>HAS</sup> ~~this morning~~ accepted our invitation to ~~come and~~ visit the United States next year. And <sup>I HAVE ACCEPTED HIS</sup> ~~a year~~ <sup>INVITATION TO GO TO MOSCOW THE FOLLOWING YEAR,</sup> ~~following I will be going to Moscow.~~

I found Mr. Gorbachev to be an energetic defender of Soviet policy. He was <sup>AN ELOQUENT SPEAKER</sup> ~~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~~ <sup>EITHER</sup> side found it uncomfortable or inconvenient.

I brought these questions to the summit and ~~we~~ 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~~ <sup>FORWARD</sup> 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 ~~shows that~~ REVEALS THAT A DEFENSE AGAINST NUCLEAR MISSILES IS 153104E  
~~we would sit down with our allies + the Soviet U. to see how we~~  
~~on deployment of defensive systems, the U.S. after consulting~~  
~~together we could replace all nuclear missiles with such a defense,~~  
~~with our allies -- would negotiate with the Soviet Union -- how~~  
WHICH THREATENS NO ONE.

~~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.~~ <sup>WHICH OBVIOUSLY DO NOT REPRESENT THE WILL OR THE APPROVAL OF THE PEOPLE.</sup> 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.

<sup>AS YOU CAN</sup>  
~~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 <sup>A NUMBER OF</sup> ~~many~~ issues, as had to be expected.

~~HOWEVER~~ 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 ~~TO EACH OTHER~~ <sup>INSTEAD OF</sup>  
<sup>ABOUT EACH OTHER.</sup>

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~~ <sup>OUR</sup> way of life. This agreement will also expand the  
opportunities for Americans to experience the Soviet people's  
rich cultural heritage. ~~BECAUSE THEIR ARTISTS & 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 <sup>EXPANSIONISM</sup> ~~interference~~ <sup>A NUMBER OF</sup> in ~~many~~ regions of the world -- ~~W H I L E T H E R E I S L I T T L E C H A N C E O F I M M E D I A T E C H A N G E~~ ~~an~~ ~~and~~ ~~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 <sup>WILL CONTINUE TO</sup> ~~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~~ <sup>BUT YES</sup> 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. ARE TO DO SUCH THINGS AS REDUCE ARMS & THIS WILL TAKE DEEDS NOT WORDS ALONE. Meetings like ours help to dispel Soviet illusions about the I BELIEVE HE IS IN AGREEMENT. resolve of the West. And that too is good.~~ <sup>WE MUST REDUCE THE MISTRUST & SUSPICIONS BETWEEN US IF WE</sup>

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  
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.

(Noonan/BE)  
November 21, 1985  
3:00 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* ~~It was~~ good 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. out [It's not hard to see how he rose to the top of that system.] He The General Secretary 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.

INSERT A

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

(A)

Insert on page 4, line 3

I am pleased to report tonight that Gen. Sec. Gorb. 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 return<sup>ed</sup> 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% 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 <sup>also</sup> opening a dialogue on combatting the spread of chemical weapons, <sup>while</sup> ~~as well, which~~ 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.

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 <sup>comparable</sup> ~~the~~ facilities <sup>or</sup> ~~for~~ the Soviet strategic defense

*in fact*  
programs, which 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. would ~~discuss with~~ *discuss with* the Soviet Union -- how ~~both sides~~ *together we* could move gradually *al* safely *o* and together, 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

-- after consulting  
with our  
Allies--

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 <sup>a # of</sup> certain 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 <sup>can</sup> may 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.

OK

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  
3:00 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. It was good 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. [It's not hard to see how he rose to the top of that system.] The General Secretary 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 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 the facilities for the Soviet strategic defense

programs, which 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. would negotiate with the Soviet Union -- how both sides could move gradually, safely, and together, 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 certain 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 may 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.

(Noonan/BE)  
November 21, 1985  
3:00 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. It was  
good 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. [It's not hard to see how he rose to the top of that system.] The General Secretary 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 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 the facilities for the Soviet strategic defense

programs, which 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. would negotiate with the Soviet Union -- how both sides could move gradually, safely, and together, 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 certain 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 may 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.

MASTER

(Noonan/BE)  
November 21, 1985  
1:30 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.

~~Thank you for this warm welcome.~~ Mr. Speaker, Senator Dole,  
I want you to know your statements of support were and are  
greatly appreciated. *It was good ~~plan~~ in dealing with  
the Soviets to have the Congress, the*

As you know, I have just come from Geneva and talks with *allies*  
General Secretary Gorbachev. In the past few days, we spent a *and the*  
~~total of 14 1/2~~ *over 15* hours in various meetings with the General  
Secretary and the members of his official party. Approximately *American*  
~~4 1/2~~ *people* of those hours were talks between Mr. Gorbachev and myself, *being*  
one on one. *That was the best part.* *behind*  
*me.*

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* a report *directly to you.*  
*we met, as we had to meet.* ~~too.~~

~~To begin with, it was essential that we 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. <sup>That's key to peace.</sup> I gained a better perspective; I <sup>feel</sup> hope 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 <sup>next year.</sup> ~~this spring.~~ <sup>And a year following I will be going to Moscow.</sup>

I found Mr. Gorbachev to be a <sup>an energetic</sup> ~~tireless and aggressive~~ defender of Soviet policy, ~~and the communist ideology.~~ <sup>[It's not hard to see how he rose to the top of that system.]</sup> The General Secretary was quite a talker, and, I believe, a good listener. 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 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. ~~or the intentions of its leaders.~~ <sup>We cannot assume</sup> But it is equally obvious that their ideology and purpose will ~~not change, and that~~ <sup>enduring</sup> ~~perpetual~~ 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 Soviets <sup>Union</sup> in a way that was, ~~we believed,~~ 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 -- ~~our defense~~ ~~modernization plan began~~ 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 <sup>reducing</sup> 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.

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

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

~~we began rebuilding~~ ~~our economy~~ ~~restoring our nations will and rebuilding our defenses and rebuilding our alliances~~

make not just for a world that feels safer but that really is safer.

I described our Strategic Defense Initiative -- our research effort that envisions 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. <sup>Nations</sup> ~~Mankind~~ could at long last ~~repeal this odious doctrine of mutual assured destruction,~~ <sup>themselves</sup> defend ~~itself~~ against <sup>missile</sup> attack, and <sup>mankind at long last</sup> 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 ~~over the Soviet Union.~~ <sup>We do not seek a first strike advantage over the Soviet Union.</sup> And to be realistic, even if we wanted ~~superiority,~~ <sup>the Soviet Union</sup> we couldn't achieve it, since the Soviet Union would keep building up its offensive systems. That's just what the Soviet Union has been doing for years, and their build-up is a source of great concern to the West.

<sup>We do not</sup> I also made it clear that we do not seek a first strike <sup>over the Soviet Union. Indeed,</sup> advantage. One of my fundamental arms control objectives is to

get rid of first strike weapons. <sup>altogether.</sup> This is why we have proposed a 50-percent reduction in <sup>the most threatening</sup> comparable offensive nuclear <sup>weapons,</sup> systems, and especially those <sup>that</sup> ~~which~~ could carry out a first strike. ~~And this is why we want to begin right now to explore with the Soviet Union the possibility of a cooperative move toward reliance on defense instead of offense.~~

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 <sup>permit</sup> ~~brief~~ Soviet experts <sup>to see first hand</sup> ~~on our research program~~ and let them see first hand that S.D.I. does not involve offensive weapons. <sup>American scientists</sup> ~~the~~ <sup>would be allowed</sup> ~~to visit the facilities for~~ <sup>the</sup> ~~Soviet strategic defense~~

~~And since we know that the Soviet Union has been conducting extensive research in strategic defense for years, we think it's time to learn more about their efforts as well. Their strategic defense programs, in fact, even go beyond research. If they seek to join us in lessening distrust, then Soviets should acknowledge their program and join us in cooperation.~~

<sup>programs which has involved much more than research for many years.</sup>

Finally, I reassured Mr. Gorbachev on another point. I promised that if our research bears fruit, prior to any decision <sup>on</sup> ~~of~~ deployment of defensive systems, the U.S. would negotiate with the Soviet Union -- how both sides could move gradually, safely, and together, toward defensive systems which would threaten no one.

~~I have told Mr. Gorbachev and I agreed that we have an~~  
~~if we could, perhaps during such lifetimes, to reduce suspicion between~~  
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,

<sup>on governing</sup>

where insurgencies that speak for the people are pitted against ~~regimes supported <sup>by the Soviet Union,</sup> imposed sustained or imposed by the Soviet Union,~~ communist-controlled or communist-backed regimes. 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. <sup>We Americans believe</sup> ~~I explained that we Americans~~ feel 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, ~~and those countries which abuse the human rights of their people tend to prey on their neighbors and upset the peace of the world.~~ Human rights, <sup>therefore,</sup> is not an abstract moral issue -- it is a peace issue. ~~And human rights is not an issue that "interferes" with our progress toward efforts for peace 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!~~

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.

<sup>urged</sup> ~~I told Mr. Gorbachev there is no justification for keeping~~ <sup>to join us in efforts to break down</sup> ~~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 certain matters, however, and, as <sup>I mentioned</sup> ~~you~~ ~~know~~, 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 ~~cultural~~ agreement ~~that is~~ designed to bring the best of America's artists and academics to the Soviet Union. The exhibits ~~alone~~ 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 <sup>build friendships</sup> ~~both help break down stereotypes~~ and, frankly, provide an alternative to ~~official~~ 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 <sup>invite other nations to</sup> join <sup>an</sup> ~~an~~ <sup>US in an</sup> ~~US in an~~ international effort to explore the feasibility of <sup>developing</sup> ~~building a~~ <sup>energy.</sup> ~~prototype fusion reactor.~~

All of these steps are part of a long-term <sup>effort to</sup> ~~process of~~ building <sup>9</sup> ~~2~~ more stable relations <sup>up</sup> with the Soviet Union. No one ever said it would be easy. But we've come a long way, ~~the past 5 years thanks to our renewed military strength, renewed confidence, and renewed economic well-being.~~

As for Soviet interference in many regions of the world -- I am afraid that there is no <sup>evidence to</sup> ~~change in their view.~~ They ~~still~~ <sup>do not seem to see</sup> contend, for example, that the Soviet invasion of Afghanistan is not a matter of liberation but of conquest. Let me be frank: We cannot hope for an <sup>early</sup> ~~immediate~~ or dramatic end to the Soviet occupation <sup>of Afghanistan.</sup> But we can support the heroic efforts of <sup>all</sup> ~~those~~ who fight for freedom in ~~Afghanistan~~ -- and this we shall do. But we have also agreed to continue -- and, if possible, to intensify -- <sup>on this and other regional conflicts and to work toward</sup> ~~our meetings with the Soviets on this and to work toward a~~ political solutions ~~of it.~~

We know the limits as well as the promise of summit meetings. <sup>This is, after all, the eleventh summit of the post war era.</sup> ~~And we believe the continued face to face involvement~~ <sup>may help bridge those differences.</sup> ~~of the leaders of the United States and the Soviet Union may help~~ <sup>and still the difference endure.</sup> ~~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 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 <sup>a start;</sup> 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 <sup>do not always yield lasting results.</sup> we cannot always control events. ~~Quick fixes don't fix big problems.~~ We must, however, do all in our power to be persuasive for peace.

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.

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. <sup>And again, as our forefathers who voyaged to America, we travelled to Geneva with peace as our goal and freedom as our guide.</sup> 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. <sup>For there can be no greater good than the quest for peace -- nor no finer purpose than the preservation of freedom.</sup>

Peace  
and  
Freedom

(Noonan/BE)  
November 21, 1985  
1:30 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.

Thank you for this warm welcome. Mr. Speaker, Senator Dole,  
I want you to know your statements of support were and are  
greatly appreciated.

As you know, I have just come from Geneva and talks with  
General Secretary Gorbachev. In the past few days, we spent a  
total of 14-1/2 hours in various meetings with the General  
Secretary and the members of his official party. Approximately  
4-1/2 of those hours were talks between Mr. Gorbachev and myself,  
one on one.

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 a report, too.

To begin with, it was essential that we 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. I gained a better perspective; I hope 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 this spring.

I found Mr. Gorbachev to be a tireless and aggressive defender of Soviet policy and the communist ideology. It's not hard to see how he rose to the top of that system. The General Secretary was quite a talker, and, I believe, a good listener. 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 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. or the intentions of its leaders. But it is equally obvious that their ideology and purpose will not change and that this implies perpetual 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 Soviets in a way that was, we believed, 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 -- our defense modernization plan began. 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 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.

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

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 described our Strategic Defense Initiative -- our research effort that envisions 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. Mankind could at long last repeal this odious doctrine of mutual assured destruction, defend itself against attack, and 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 over the Soviet Union. And to be realistic, even if we wanted superiority, we couldn't achieve it, since the Soviet Union would keep building up its offensive systems. That's just what the Soviet Union has been doing for years, and their build-up is a source of great concern to the West.

I also made it clear that we do not seek a first strike advantage. One of my fundamental arms control objectives is to

get rid of first strike weapons. This is why we have proposed a 50-percent reduction in comparable offensive nuclear systems, and especially those which could carry out a first strike. And this is why we want to begin right now to explore with the Soviet Union the possibility of a cooperative move toward reliance on defense instead of offense.

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 brief Soviet experts on our research program and let them see first hand that S.D.I. does not involve offensive weapons.

And since we know that the Soviet Union has been conducting extensive research in strategic defense for years, we think it's time to learn more about their efforts as well. Their strategic defense programs, in fact, even go beyond research. If they seek to join us in lessening distrust, then Soviets should acknowledge their program and join us in cooperation.

Finally, I reassured Mr. Gorbachev on another point. I promised that if our research bears fruit, prior to any decision of deployment of defensive systems, the U.S. would negotiate with the Soviet Union -- how both sides could move gradually, safely, and together, 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 communist-controlled or communist-backed regimes. 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. I explained that we Americans feel 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 -- and those countries which abuse the human rights of their people tend to 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 an issue that "interferes" with our efforts for peace 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!

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 told Mr. Gorbachev there is no justification for keeping 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 certain matters, however, and, as you know, 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 cultural agreement that is designed to bring the best of America's artists and academics to the Soviet Union. The exhibits alone 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 both help break down stereotypes and, frankly, provide an alternative to official 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 join an international effort to explore the feasibility of building a prototype fusion reactor.

All of these steps are part of a long-term process of building more stable relations with the Soviet Union. No one ever said it would be easy. But we've come a long way the past 5 years thanks to our renewed military strength, renewed confidence, and renewed economic well-being.

As for Soviet interference in many regions of the world -- I am afraid that there is no change in their view. They still contend, for example, that the Soviet invasion of Afghanistan is not a matter of liberation but of conquest. Let me be frank: We cannot hope for an immediate or dramatic end to the Soviet occupation. But we can support the heroic efforts of those who fight for freedom in Afghanistan -- 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 to work toward a political solution of it.

We know the limits as well as the promise of summit meetings. And we believe the continued face-to-face involvement of the leaders of the United States and the Soviet Union may 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 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 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 must, however, do all in our power to be persuasive for peace. 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.

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 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.