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: Address to the Nation on Pre-Summit Meeting with General Secretary Gorbachev (Dolan) (Hayes) 10/13/1986 File #1 (4)

Box: 298

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

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

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

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

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

WITHDRAWAL SHEET

Ronald Reagan Library

| DOCUMENT NO. AND TYPE | SUBJECT/TITLE | DATE | RESTRICTION | | |
|---|------------------------------|----------|------------------|--|--|
| l. draft | 2:30 p.m. p. 6 (1p, partial) | 10/11/86 | ₹5 | | |
| 2. draft | 2:30 p.m. p. 8 (1p. partial) | 10/11/86 | P5 (CG) 12/22/00 | | |
| | , | | | | |
| | | | | | |
| | | | | | |
| | | | | | |
| | | | | | |
| | | | | | |
| | | | | | |
| | | | | | |
| | | | , i | | |
| | | | | | |
| | | | | | |
| | | | | | |
| | | | | | |
| | | | | | |
| | | | | | |
| | | | | | |
| COLLECTION | | | | | |
| COLLECTION: SPEECHWRITING, WHITE HOUSE OFFICE OF: Speech Drafts | | | | | |
| FILE FOLDER: | | Box 328 | | | |
| File 1: Add. to the Nation on Pre-Summit meeting with Gorbachev, 10/23/86 [4 of 6] OA 12886 4/20/94 | | | | | |

RESTRICTION CODES

Presidential Records Act - [44 U.S.C. 2204(a)]

- P-1 National security classified information [(a)(1) of the PRA].
- P-2 Relating to appointment to Federal office [(a)(2) of the PRA].
- P-3 Release would violate a Federal statute [(a)(3) of the PRA].
- P-4 Release would disclose trade secrets or confidential commercial or financial information [(a)(4) of the PRA].
- P-5 Release would disclose confidential advice between the President and his advisors, or between such advisors [(a)(5) of the PRA.
- P-6 Release would constitute a clearly unwarranted invasion of personal privacy [(a)(6) of the PRA].

Freedom of Information Act - [5 U.S.C. 552(b)]

- F-2 Release could disclose internal personnel rules and practices of an agency [(b)(2) of the FOIA].
- F-7 Release would disclose information compiled for law enforcement purposes [(b)(7) of the FOIA].
- F-8 Release would disclose information concerning the regulation of financial institutions [(b)(8) of the FOIA].
- F-9 Release would disclose geological or geophysical information concerning wells [(b)(9) of the FOIA].
- Closed in accordance with restrictions contained in donor's deed of gift.

WITHDRAWAL SHEET

Ronald Reagan Library

| DOCUMENT NO. AND TYPE | SUBJECT/TITLE | DATE | RESTRICTION | |
|---|------------------------------|----------|-------------|--|
| 1. draft | 2:30 p.m. p. 6 (1p, partial) | 10/11/86 | P5 | |
| 2. draft | 2:30 p.m. p. 8 (1p. partial) | 10/11/86 | P5 | |
| | · | | | |
| | | | | |
| | | | | |
| | | | | |
| | | | | |
| | | | | |
| | | | | |
| | | | | |
| | | | | |
| | | | | |
| | | u . | | |
| | | | | |
| | | | | |
| | | | | |
| COLLECTION: | | | ggc | |
| SPEECHWRITING, WHITE HOUSE OFFICE OF: Speech Drafts | | | | |
| FILE FOLDER: File 1: Add. to the Nation on Pre-Summit meeting with Gorbachev, 10/23/86 [4 of 6] OA 12886 4/20/94 | | | | |

RESTRICTION CODES

Presidential Records Act - [44 U.S.C. 2204(a)]

- P-1 National security classified information [(a)(1) of the PRA].
- P-2 Relating to appointment to Federal office [(a)(2) of the PRA].
- P-3 Release would violate a Federal statute [(a)(3) of the PRA].
- P-4 Release would disclose trade secrets or confidential commercial or financial information [(a)(4) of the PRA].
- P-5 Release would disclose confidential advice between the President and his advisors, or between such advisors [(a)(5) of the PRA.
- P-6 Release would constitute a clearly unwarranted invasion of personal privacy [(a)(6) of the PRA].

Freedom of Information Act - [5 U.S.C. 552(b)]

- F-2 Release could disclose internal personnel rules and practices of an agency [(b)(2) of the FOIA].
- F-7 Release would disclose information compiled for law enforcement purposes [(b)(7) of the FOIA].
- F-8 Release would disclose information concerning the regulation of financial institutions [(b)(8) of the FOIA].
- F-9 Release would disclose geological or geophysical information concerning wells [(b)(9) of the FOIA].
- Closed in accordance with restrictions contained in donor's deed of gift.

ohey 10gB

STAFFING SHEET

10/12/86

REGAN

POINDEXTER

BUCHANAN

HENKEL

SPEAKES

THOMAS

CHEW

DAWSON

DOLAN

Attached is a copy of the Address to the Nation. Comments are due back to Tony Dolan before Air Force One departure with an informational copy to David Chew.

(DOLAN)
October 12, 1986
9:00 a.m. (Iceland)

PRESIDENTIAL REMARKS: ADDRESS TO THE NATION ICELAND MEETING MONDAY, OCTOBER 13, 1986

A. A.

Good evening. As most of you know, I have just returned from meetings with the leader of the Soviet Union, General Secretary Gorbachev, in Iceland. As I did last year when I returned from the summit conference in Geneva, I want to take a few moments tonight to explain what took place in these discussions.

But first, let me remind you that from the start of my meetings with Mr. Gorbachev I have always regarded you, the American people, as full participants. Believe me, without your support and participation, none of these talks could have been held, nor could the ultimate aims of American foreign policy -- world peace and freedom -- be pursued. This faith in the intuitive wisdom of the people and the consent of the governed are the founding principles of our Republic. And it is for these principles, I went the extra mile to Iceland.

I just wish the other items on our agenda in Iceland could have been as easily resolved. Don't mistake me; the Iceland talks were useful and quite productive -- more so than I believe either party originally anticipated. But, they were also sobering -- they brought home again the truth of the statement that nations do not mistrust each other because they are armed; they are armed because they mistrust each other. The differences between the United States and the Soviet Union are deep and abiding and, as I have candidly told Mr. Gorbachev himself, our view of the source of that mistrust remains the same: the Soviet Union's record of attempting to impose its ideology and rule on the world.

But because there are no diplomatic quick-fixes to such profound differences, we adopted in Iceland the prudent, realistic and above all deliberate approach with the Soviets that we have pursued from the earliest days of our administration. We had no illusions about the Soviets or their ultimate intentions; we were publicly candid about the critical moral distinctions between totalitarianism and democracy. We said that the principal objective of American foreign policy is not just the prevention of war but the extension of freedom. And, we stressed our commitment to the growth of democratic government and democratic institutions around the world; that is why we assisted freedom fighters who were resisting the imposition of totalitarian rule in Afghanistan, Nicaragua, Angola Cambodia and elsewhere.

And yet at the same time we set out these foreign policy goals and began working towards them, we pursued another of our

major objectives: that of seeking means to lessen tensions with the Soviets, ways to prevent war and keep the peace.

And it is all of this that makes this current summit process so very different from that of previous decades. America is no longer under seige. To the contrary, today America's economic and military power is resurgent, the Western democracies and the NATO alliance are revitalized, and all across the world nations are turning to democratic ideas and the principles of the free market.

Yes, the atmosphere surrounding the current summit process is different, different because the world is different; different because of the hard work and sacrifice of the American people over the past five and one half years. Your energy has restored and expanded our economy, your self-sacrifice has restored our military strength; and your courage and sense of national unity in times of crisis have given pause to our adversaries, heartened our friends and inspired the world. Freedom is on the march today; because at its critical hour the American people stood guard while it gathered its forces and regained its strength.

Indeed, if there is one impression I carry away with me from these October talks, it is that we are seeing now those first tentative signs of a harvest of peace and freedom planted by the strength and resolve of the American people and their allies. A harvest that is found not in the simple fact of these here to the strength and resolve of the simple fact of these here the strength and st

movements towards human rights, personal freedom and the

restraint of or the military force

One sign of this in Iceland was the discussion of the key

issue of arms control. I think you know that when I came to

A

Ind V

negotiations. Arms agreements would no longer be allowed to justify the arms race, to intensify it, or to guarantee Soviet superiority. That is why in the early 1980s the United States sought to restore the balance and rebuild our strategic forces. But even as we took these steps, I put forth a series of new proposals calling not just for arms control but for arms reduction. We called for a 50% reduction in strategic offensive missiles and for the total elimination of the intermediate range nuclear forces that are so threatening to our allies in Europe, and Asia. And in related fields such as nuclear testing and chemical and biological weapons we proposed equally important reductions.

And finally, we launched a research program and to revolutionary new technologies that could destroy ballistic missiles in flight -- looking to a day when the huge arsenals of these missiles would be obsolete, and defense strategies would rely on protection of our peoples rather than on perpetuating populations, their vulnerability. And we offered to the Soviet Union an agreement by which they could join with us in cooperative transition to this new strategic environment of mutual security.

All this was on the table in Iceland. And, I am pleased to report to you that in several of these areas, the Soviets made serious responses. (INSERT)

I cannot predict the nature or dates of future agreements. What I can say is that for the first time in a long time, Soviet-American negotiations in these areas are moving, and

moving in the right direction: not just arms control but arms reduction.

For some time before our talks began, I had been saying that arms control negotiations alone could not bear the full weight of Soviet-American relations; that as I said, the real cause of the arms competition was political tensions growing out of our deeper differences. In short, doing more about arms control meant talking about more than arms control. So I proposed "umbrella talks" with the Soviets -- to expand the negotiating agenda, to go to the real source of the differences between the Soviets and ourselves the Mark.

One such issue is human rights. As President Kennedy once said, "Is not peace, in the final analysis, a matter of human rights .?" Only last week, here in the Oval Office, a heroic champion human rights in the Soviet Union, Yuri Orlov, described to me the persecution he suffered for leading an effort to get the Soviet government to live up to the human rights agreements it signed at Helsinki in 1975. Mr. Orlov's suffering is like those of far too many other individuals at all walks of life in the Soviet Union — including those who wish to emigrate.

And that is why i made it plain to Mr. Gorbachev that the

United States would not seek to exploit improvement in these

matters for purposes of propaganda. But I also make it plain, that an improvement of the human condition within the Soviet

Union is indispensable for an improvement in bilateral relations

with the United States. For a government that will break faith

with its own people cannot be trusted to keep faith with foreign

powers. If the best and brightest inside the Soviet Union --

like Mr. Orlov -- cannot trust the Soviet Government, how then can the rest of the world? So, I told Mr. Gorbachev -- again in Reykjavik as I had in Geneva -- we Americans place far less weight upon the words that are spoken at meetings such as these, than upon the deeds that follow. When it comes to human rights and judging Soviet intentions, we are all from Missouri; you have got to show us.

Another subject area we took up in Iceland lies at the heart of the differences between the Soviet Union and America. This is the issue of regional conflicts. I told Mr. Gorbachev that the good feeling at summits cannot make the American people forget what Soviet actions have meant for the people of Afghanistan, Central America, Africa and Southeast Asia. Until Soviet policies change, we will make sure that our friends in these areas -- those who fight for freedom and independence -- will have the support they need. And (INSERT -- Afghanistan)

So once again, I think these were useful discussions.

Finally, there was a fourth item besides arms reduction,

human rights and the resolution of regional conflicts. This area was that of bilateral or people-to-people contacts. In Geneva last year, we welcomed the signing of several cultural exchange accords; in Iceland, we saw indications of more movement in these areas. But let me say now the United States remains committed to people-to-people programs that could lead to exchanges between not just a few elites but thousands of everyday citizens from both our countries.

So I think then you can see that we did make progress in Iceland on a broad range of topics. We set a date for a

We get believe that No agreement.

Page 7

full-fledged summit; we reestablished our four point agenda; we discovered some new grounds of agreement; we probed again some areas of disagreement.

Now my fellow Americans, I cannot promise, nor can any

President promise, that the talks in Iceland or our future

discussions with Mr. Gorbachev here in the United States will

lead inevitably to great breakthroughs or momentous treaty

signings. Indeed, we must bear in mind that because of the

nature of the Soviet regime itself, many obstacles will be put in our path as we go along. When that happens, we must be prepared, not surprised. We must not permit such developments to disorient our policy or derail our initiatives. We must be deliberate and candid and make it clear, as we did in the recent Daniloff case, that the Soviet Union will be held responsible for its actions.

I can tell you that I am ultimately hopeful about the prospects for world peace and freedom. I know such optimism in a century that has seen so much war and suffering brought on by totalitarian rule seems unwarranted to some. Yet this confidence is based on more than an easy optimism; it springs from a quiet realization that totalitarian or militarist societies enjoy only initial advantages over free nations, advantages that, as British author Paul Johnson points out, are far outweighed by the "enormous reserves" of democratic societies, societies where national unity springs from popular consent.

The resilency of a free society is one of the comforting lessons of history. And because of you, the American people, those enormous reserves are now making their presence and power felt throughout the world.

the Freedom of ollow who have to make the second of the total of the total of the second of the seco

Page 8

I saw evidence of this when we left Iceland yesterday, and I spoke to our young men and women at our Naval installation there -- a critically important base far closer to Soviet naval ports than to our own coastline. As always, I was proud to spend a few moments with them and thank them for their sacrifices and devotion to country. They represent America at its best: committed to defend not only our own freedom but also the freedom of our allies and all the world; committed to maintaining the strength and resolve that makes possible productive negotiations with adversaries.

"Wherever the banner of liberty is unfurled, there shall be America's heart, her prayers and her benedictions," John Adams once said. He spoke well of our destiny as a nation. My fellow Americans, we are honored by history, entrusted in our time with the oldest dream of humanity -- the dream of peace and freedom.

It is in pursuit of that dream I went to Geneva a year ago and to Iceland last week; it is in pursuit of that dream I have invited Mr. Gorbachev to visit us here for further discussions.

And it is in pursuit of that dream that I thank you now for all the support you have given me in the past, and again ask for your help and your prayers as we continue our journey towards peace and a world where hand rights and personal freedom are is enshrined.

Thank you and God bless you.

STAFFING SHEET

REGAN

POINDEXTER

BUCHANAN

HENKEL

SPEAKES

THOMAS

CHEW

DAWSON

DOLAN

Attached is a copy of the Address to the Nation. Comments are due back to Tony Dolan before Air Force One departure with an informational copy to David Chew.

(DOLAN)
October 12, 1986
9:00 a.m. (Iceland)

PRESIDENTIAL REMARKS: ADDRESS TO THE NATION ICELAND MEETING MONDAY, OCTOBER 13, 1986

Good evening. As most of you know, I have just returned from meetings with the leader of the Soviet Union, General Secretary Gorbachev, in Iceland. As I did last year when I returned from the summit conference in Geneva, I want to take a few moments tonight to explain what took place in these discussions.

But first, let me remind you that from the start of my meetings with Mr. Gorbachev I have always regarded you, the American people, as full participants. Believe me, without your support and participation, none of these talks could have been held, nor could the ultimate aims of American foreign policy — world peace and freedom — be pursued. This faith in the intuitive wisdom of the people and the consent of the governed are the founding principles of our Republic. And it is for these principles, I went the extra mile to Iceland.

These most recent meetings with the Soviet leaders were intended as preparatory meetings, a planning session for a full fledged summit conference to be held when Mr. Gorbachev visits the United States. And tonight I am pleased to report to you that as Mr. Gorbachev and I agreed yesterday in Reykjavik the Soviet leader will be visiting America in the month of next year. It is my hope that at that time both sides can

Les continue the work we have begun together in Geneva and Iceland.

The there les cossions proved to far more

5 conful to the

vere hand and tout sait extremely

Page 2

the world.

I just wish the other items on our agenda in Iceland could have been as easily resolved. Don't mistake me; the Iceland talks were useful and quite productive more so than I believe either party originally anticipated. But, they were also sobering — they brought home again the truth of the statement that nations do not mistrust each other because they are armed; they are armed because they mistrust each other. The differences between the United States and the Soviet Union are deep and abiding and, as I have candidly told Mr. Gorbachev himself, our view of the source of that mistrust remains the same: the Soviet Union's record of attempting to impose its ideology and rule on

Eus Of wives by these

profound differences, we adopted in Isoland the prudent, realistic and above all deliberate approach with the Soviets that we have pursued from the earliest days of our administration. We had no illusions about the Soviets or their ultimate intentions; we were publicly candid about the critical moral distinctions between totalitarianism and democracy. We said that the principal objective of American foreign policy is not just the prevention of war but the extension of freedom. And, we stressed our commitment to the growth of democratic government and democratic institutions around the world; that is why we assisted freedom fighters who were resisting the imposition of totalitarian rule in Afghanistan, Nicaragua, Angola Cambodia and elsewhere.

there are no diplomatic quick-fixes

And yet at the same time we set out these foreign policy goals and began working towards them, we pursued another of our

than

major objectives: that of seeking means to lessen tensions with the Soviets, ways to prevent war and keep the peace.

And it is all of this that makes this current summit process so very different from that of previous decades. America is no longer under seige. To the contrary, today America's economic and military power is resurgent, the Western democracies and the NATO alliance are revitalized, and all across the world nations are turning to democratic ideas and the principles of the free market.

Yes, the atmosphere surrounding the current summit process is different, different because the world is different; different because of the hard work and sacrifice of the American people over the past five and one half years. Your energy has restored and expanded our economy, your self-sacrifice has restored our military strength; and your courage and sense of national unity in times of crisis have given pause to our adversaries, heartened our friends and inspired the world. Freedom is on the march today; because at its critical hour the American people stood guard while it gathered its forces and regained its strength.

Indeed, if there is one impression I carry away with me from these October talks, it is that we are seeing now those first tentative signs of a harvest of peace and freedom planted by the strength and resolve of the American people and their allies. A harvest that is found not in the simple fact of these movements towards human rights, personal freedom and the restraint of brute military torce.

One sign of this in Iceland was the discussion of the key issue of arms control. I think you know that when I came to

office I committed America to a new realism about arms negotiations. Arms agreements would no longer be allowed to justify the arms race, to intensify it, or to guarantee Soviet superiority. That is why in the early 1980s the United States sought to restore the balance and rebuild our strategic forces. But even as we took these steps, I put forth a series of new proposals calling not just for arms control but for arms reduction. We called for a 50% reduction in strategic offensive missiles and for the total elimination of the intermediate range nuclear forces that are so threatening to our allies in Europe and Asia. And in related fields such as nuclear testing and chemical and biological weapons we proposed equally important reductions.

And finally, we launched a research program and revolutionary new technologies that could destroy ballistic missiles in flight -- looking to a day when the huge arsenals of these missiles would be obsolete, and defense strategies would rely on protection of our peoples rather than on perpetuating their vulnerability. And we offered to the Soviet Union an agreement by which they could join with us in cooperative transition to this new strategic environment of mutual security.

All this was on the table in Iceland. And, I am pleased to report to you that in several of these areas, the Soviets made serious responses. (INSERT)

I cannot predict the nature or dates of future agreements. What I can say is that for the first time in a long time, Soviet-American negotiations in these areas are moving, and

moving in the right direction: not just arms <u>control</u> but arms reduction.

For some time before our talks began, I had been saying that arms control negotiations alone could not bear the full weight of Soviet-American relations; that as I said, the real cause of the arms competition was political tensions growing out of our deeper differences. In short, doing more about arms control meant talking about more than arms control. So I proposed "umbrella talks" with the Soviets -- to expand the negotiating agenda, to go to the real source of the differences between the Soviets and ourselves.

One such issue is human rights. As President Kennedy once said, "Is not peace, in the final analysis, a matter of human rights . .?" Only last week, here in the Oval Office, a heroic champion human rights in the Soviet Union, Yuri Orlov, described to me the persecution he suffered for leading an effort to get the Soviet government to live up to the human rights agreements it signed at Helsinki in 1975. Mr. Orlov's suffering is like those of far too many other individuals of all walks of life in the Soviet Union — including those who wish to emigrate.

And that is why I made it plain to Mr. Gorbachev that the United States would not seek to exploit improvement in these matters for purposes of propaganda. But I also make it plain that an improvement of the human condition within the Soviet Union is indispensable for an improvement in bilateral relations with the United States. For a government that will break faith with its own people cannot be trusted to keep faith with foreign powers. If the best and brightest inside the Soviet Union --

like Mr. Orlov -- cannot trust the Soviet Government, how then can the rest of the world? So, I told Mr. Gorbachev -- again in Reykjavik as I had in Geneva -- we Americans place far less weight upon the words that are spoken at meetings such as these, than upon the deeds that follow. When it comes to human rights and judging Soviet intentions, we are all from Missouri; you have got to show us.

Another subject area we took up in Iceland lies at the heart of the differences between the Soviet Union and America. This is the issue of regional conflicts. I told Mr. Gorbachev that the good feeling at summits cannot make the American people forget what Soviet actions have meant for the people of Afghanistan, Central America, Africa and Southeast Asia. Until Soviet policies change, we will make sure that our friends in these areas -- those who fight for freedom and independence -- will have the support they need. And (INSERT -- Afghanistan)

So once again, I think these were useful discussions.

Finally, there was a fourth item besides arms reduction, human rights and the resolution of regional conflicts. This area was that of bilateral or people-to-people contacts. In Geneva last year, we welcomed the signing of several cultural exchange accords; in Iceland, we saw indications of more movement in these areas. But let me say now the United States remains committed to people-to-people programs that could lead to exchanges between not just a few elites but thousands of everyday citizens from both our countries.

So I think then you can see that we did make progress in Iceland on a broad range of topics. We set a date for a

full-fledged summit; we reestablished our four point agenda; we discovered some new grounds of agreement; we probed again some areas of disagreement.

Now my fellow Americans, I cannot promise, nor can any President promise, that the talks in Iceland or our future discussions with Mr. Gorbachev here in the United States will lead inevitably to great breakthroughs or momentous treaty signings. Indeed, we must bear in mind that because of the nature of the Soviet regime itself, many obstacles will be put in our path as we go along. When that happens, we must be prepared, not surprised. We must not permit such developments to disorient our policy or derail our initiatives. We must be deliberate and candid and make it clear, as we did in the recent Daniloff case, that the Soviet Union will be held responsible for its actions.

I can tell you that I am ultimately hopeful about the prospects for world peace and freedom. I know such optimism in a century that has seen so much war and suffering brought on by totalitarian rule seems unwarranted to some. Yet this confidence is based on more than an easy optimism; it springs from a quiet realization that totalitarian or militarist societies enjoy only initial advantages over free nations, advantages that, as British author Paul Johnson points out, are far outweighed by the "enormous reserves" of democratic societies, societies where national unity springs from popular consent.

The resilency of a free society is one of the comforting lessons of history. And because of you, the American people, those enormous reserves are now making their presence and power felt throughout the world.

I saw evidence of this when we left Iceland yesterday, and I spoke to our young men and women at our Naval installation there -- a critically important base far closer to Soviet naval ports than to our own coastline. As always, I was proud to spend a few moments with them and thank them for their sacrifices and devotion to country. They represent America at its best: committed to defend not only our own freedom but also the freedom of our allies and all the world; committed to maintaining the strength and resolve that makes possible productive negotiations with adversaries.

"Wherever the banner of liberty is unfurled, there shall be America's heart, her prayers and her benedictions," John Adams once said. He spoke well of our destiny as a nation. My fellow Americans, we are honored by history, entrusted in our time with the oldest dream of humanity -- the dream of peace and freedom.

It is in pursuit of that dream I went to Geneva a year ago and to Iceland last week; it is in pursuit of that dream I have invited Mr. Gorbachev to visit us here for further discussions. And it is in pursuit of that dream that I thank you now for all the support you have given me in the past, and again ask for your help and your prayers as we continue our journey towards peace and a world where human rights and personal freedom are enshrined.

Thank you and God bless you.

(DOLAN)
October 12, 1986
9:00 a.m. (Iceland)

PRESIDENTIAL REMARKS: ADDRESS TO THE NATION ICELAND MEETING MONDAY, OCTOBER 13, 1986

Good evening. As most of you know, I have just returned from meetings with the leader of the Soviet Union, General Secretary Gorbachev, in Iceland. As I did last year when I returned from the summit conference in Geneva, I want to take a few moments tonight to explain what took place in these discussions.

But first, let me remind you that from the start of my meetings with Mr. Gorbachev I have always regarded you, the American people, as full participants. Believe me, without your support and participation, none of these talks could have been held, nor could the ultimate aims of American foreign policy — world peace and freedom — be pursued. This faith in the intuitive wisdom of the people and the consent of the governed are the founding principles of our Republic. And it is for these principles, I went the extra mile to Iceland.

These most recent meetings with the Soviet leaders were intended as preparatory meetings, a planning session for a full fledged summit conference to be held when Mr. Gorbachev visits the United States. And tonight I am pleased to report to you that as Mr. Gorbachev and I agreed yesterday in Reykjavik the Soviet leader will be visiting America in the month of next year. It is my hope that at that time both sides can continue the work we have begun together in Geneva and Iceland.

I just wish the other items on our agenda in Iceland could have been as easily resolved. Don't mistake me; the Iceland talks were useful and quite productive -- more so than I believe either party originally anticipated. But, they were also sobering -- they brought home again the truth of the statement that nations do not mistrust each other because they are armed; they are armed because they mistrust each other. The differences between the United States and the Soviet Union are deep and abiding and, as I have candidly told Mr. Gorbachev himself, our view of the source of that mistrust remains the same: the Soviet Union's record of attempting to impose its ideology and rule on the world.

But because there are no diplomatic quick-fixes to such profound differences, we adopted in Iceland the prudent, realistic and above all deliberate approach with the Soviets that we have pursued from the earliest days of our administration. We had no illusions about the Soviets or their ultimate intentions; we were publicly candid about the critical moral distinctions between totalitarianism and democracy. We said that the principal objective of American foreign policy is not just the prevention of war but the extension of freedom. And, we stressed our commitment to the growth of democratic government and democratic institutions around the world; that is why we assisted freedom fighters who were resisting the imposition of totalitarian rule in Afghanistan, Nicaragua, Angola Cambodia and elsewhere.

And yet at the same time we set out these foreign policy goals and began working towards them, we pursued another of our

major objectives: that of seeking means to lessen tensions with the Soviets, ways to prevent war and keep the peace.

And it is all of this that makes this current summit process so very different from that of previous decades. America is no longer under seige. To the contrary, today America's economic and military power is resurgent, the Western democracies and the NATO alliance are revitalized, and all across the world nations are turning to democratic ideas and the principles of the free market.

Yes, the atmosphere surrounding the current summit process is different, different because the world is different; different because of the hard work and sacrifice of the American people over the past five and one half years. Your energy has restored and expanded our economy, your self-sacrifice has restored our military strength; and your courage and sense of national unity in times of crisis have given pause to our adversaries, heartened our friends and inspired the world. Freedom is on the march today; because at its critical hour the American people stood guard while it gathered its forces and regained its strength.

Indeed, if there is one impression I carry away with me from these October talks, it is that we are seeing now those first tentative signs of a harvest of peace and freedom planted by the strength and resolve of the American people and their allies. A harvest that is found not in the simple fact of these movements towards human rights, personal freedom and the restraint of brute military force.

One sign of this in Iceland was the discussion of the key issue of arms control. I think you know that when I came to

office I committed America to a new realism about arms negotiations. Arms agreements would no longer be allowed to justify the arms race, to intensify it, or to guarantee Soviet superiority. That is why in the early 1980s the United States sought to restore the balance and rebuild our strategic forces. But even as we took these steps, I put forth a series of new proposals calling not just for arms control but for arms reduction. We called for a 50% reduction in strategic offensive missiles and for the total elimination of the intermediate range nuclear forces that are so threatening to our allies in Europe and Asia. And in related fields such as nuclear testing and chemical and biological weapons we proposed equally important reductions.

And finally, we launched a research program and revolutionary new technologies that could destroy ballistic missiles in flight -- looking to a day when the huge arsenals of these missiles would be obsolete, and defense strategies would rely on protection of our peoples rather than on perpetuating their vulnerability. And we offered to the Soviet Union an agreement by which they could join with us in cooperative transition to this new strategic environment of mutual security.

All this was on the table in Iceland. And, I am pleased to report to you that in several of these areas, the Soviets made serious responses. (INSERT)

I cannot predict the nature or dates of future agreements. What I can say is that for the first time in a long time, Soviet-American negotiations in these areas are moving, and

moving in the right direction: not just arms <u>control</u> but arms reduction.

For some time before our talks began, I had been saying that arms control negotiations alone could not bear the full weight of Soviet-American relations; that as I said, the real cause of the arms competition was political tensions growing out of our deeper differences. In short, doing more about arms control meant talking about more than arms control. So I proposed "umbrella talks" with the Soviets -- to expand the negotiating agenda, to go to the real source of the differences between the Soviets and ourselves.

One such issue is human rights. As President Kennedy once said, "Is not peace, in the final analysis, a matter of human rights . .?" Only last week, here in the Oval Office, a heroic champion human rights in the Soviet Union, Yuri Orlov, described to me the persecution he suffered for leading an effort to get the Soviet government to live up to the human rights agreements it signed at Helsinki in 1975. Mr. Orlov's suffering is like those of far too many other individuals of all walks of life in the Soviet Union -- including those who wish to emigrate.

And that is why I made it plain to Mr. Gorbachev that the United States would not seek to exploit improvement in these matters for purposes of propaganda. But I also make it plain that an improvement of the human condition within the Soviet Union is indispensable for an improvement in bilateral relations with the United States. For a government that will break faith with its own people cannot be trusted to keep faith with foreign powers. If the best and brightest inside the Soviet Union --

like Mr. Orlov -- cannot trust the Soviet Government, how then can the rest of the world? So, I told Mr. Gorbachev -- again in Reykjavik as I had in Geneva -- we Americans place far less weight upon the words that are spoken at meetings such as these, than upon the deeds that follow. When it comes to human rights and judging Soviet intentions, we are all from Missouri; you have got to show us.

Another subject area we took up in Iceland lies at the heart of the differences between the Soviet Union and America. This is the issue of regional conflicts. I told Mr. Gorbachev that the good feeling at summits cannot make the American people forget what Soviet actions have meant for the people of Afghanistan, Central America, Africa and Southeast Asia. Until Soviet policies change, we will make sure that our friends in these areas -- those who fight for freedom and independence -- will have the support they need. And (INSERT -- Afghanistan)

So once again, I think these were useful discussions.

Finally, there was a fourth item besides arms reduction, human rights and the resolution of regional conflicts. This area was that of bilateral or people-to-people contacts. In Geneva last year, we welcomed the signing of several cultural exchange accords; in Iceland, we saw indications of more movement in these areas. But let me say now the United States remains committed to people-to-people programs that could lead to exchanges between not just a few elites but thousands of everyday citizens from both our countries.

So I think then you can see that we did make progress in Iceland on a broad range of topics. We set a date for a

full-fledged summit; we reestablished our four point agenda; we discovered some new grounds of agreement; we probed again some areas of disagreement.

Now my fellow Americans, I cannot promise, nor can any President promise, that the talks in Iceland or our future discussions with Mr. Gorbachev here in the United States will lead inevitably to great breakthroughs or momentous treaty signings. Indeed, we must bear in mind that because of the nature of the Soviet regime itself, many obstacles will be put in our path as we go along. When that happens, we must be prepared, not surprised. We must not permit such developments to disorient our policy or derail our initiatives. We must be deliberate and candid and make it clear, as we did in the recent Daniloff case, that the Soviet Union will be held responsible for its actions.

I can tell you that I am ultimately hopeful about the prospects for world peace and freedom. I know such optimism in a century that has seen so much war and suffering brought on by totalitarian rule seems unwarranted to some. Yet this confidence is based on more than an easy optimism; it springs from a quiet realization that totalitarian or militarist societies enjoy only initial advantages over free nations, advantages that, as British author Paul Johnson points out, are far outweighed by the "enormous reserves" of democratic societies, societies where national unity springs from popular consent.

The resilency of a free society is one of the comforting lessons of history. And because of you, the American people, those enormous reserves are now making their presence and power felt throughout the world.

I saw evidence of this when we left Iceland yesterday, and I spoke to our young men and women at our Naval installation there -- a critically important base far closer to Soviet naval ports than to our own coastline. As always, I was proud to spend a few moments with them and thank them for their sacrifices and devotion to country. They represent America at its best: committed to defend not only our own freedom but also the freedom of our allies and all the world; committed to maintaining the strength and resolve that makes possible productive negotiations with adversaries.

"Wherever the banner of liberty is unfurled, there shall be America's heart, her prayers and her benedictions," John Adams once said. He spoke well of our destiny as a nation. My fellow Americans, we are honored by history, entrusted in our time with the oldest dream of humanity -- the dream of peace and freedom.

It is in pursuit of that dream I went to Geneva a year ago and to Iceland last week; it is in pursuit of that dream I have invited Mr. Gorbachev to visit us here for further discussions. And it is in pursuit of that dream that I thank you now for all the support you have given me in the past, and again ask for your help and your prayers as we continue our journey towards peace and a world where human rights and personal freedom are enshrined.

Thank you and God bless you.

STAFFING SHEET

REGAN

POINDEXTER

BUCHANAN

HENKEL

SPEAKES

THOMAS

CHEW

DAWSON

DOLAN

Attached is a copy of the Address to the Nation. Comments are due back to Tony Dolan before Air Force One departure with an informational copy to David Chew.

(DOLAN)
October 11, 1986
2:30 p.m. (Iceland)

PRESIDENTIAL REMARKS: ADDRESS TO THE NATION ICELAND MEETING MONDAY, OCTOBER 13, 1986

Good evening. As most of you know, I have just returned from meetings with the leader of the Soviet Union, General Secretary Gorbachev, in Iceland. As I did last year when I returned from the summit conference in Geneva, I want to take a few moments tonight to explain what took place in these discussions.

But first, let me say it's good to be home, and remind you that from the very start of my meetings with Mr. Gorbachev I have always regarded you, the American people, as full participants. I know it may surprise the General Secretary to learn that all this time there was a third party in the room, but, believe me, without your support and participation, none of these talks could have been held, nor could the ultimate aims of American foreign policy -- world peace and freedom -- be pursued. I am reporting to you tonight because this faith in the intuitive wisdom of the people and the consent of the governed are the founding principles of our Republic. And it is for these principles, I went that extra mile to Iceland.

Let me begin by pointing out one important way in which the discussions I've just returned from in Iceland were unlike the earlier ones in Geneva: they were not a full-blown summit conference; they were preparatory meetings, a planning session



for a future summit conference. Iceland was a base camp before the summit.

You see, when Mr. Gorbachev and I met for the first time last year in Geneva we quickly settled one question the experts thought would be troublesome. While we were out walking together I told him that I would like him to see the United States and invited him to visit, and he said: "I accept." And then he told me he would like me to see the Soviet Union and invited me. And I said: "I accept." And so, the supposedly thorny question of future summits and their locations was settled as simply as that; I think you can see why face-to-face discussions between leaders of nations are frequently helpful.

But in Geneva, we did leave one critical matter unresolved:
the exact date of those future conferences. So in Iceland, this
was our top agenda item. I am pleased to report to you tonight
that we made progress, that -- as agreed in Geneva a year ago -the next summit will take place here in the United States and -as Mr. Gorbachev and I agreed yesterday in Reykjavik -- the
Soviet leader will be visiting America in the month of
next year. I told Mr. Gorbachev this was a good time to visit us
here because(e.g.Mr. Thomas will be on vacation, and the
mess will have a full supply of chocolate chip cookies.)

I just wish the other items on our agenda could have been as easily resolved. Don't mistake me; the Iceland talks were useful and quite productive -- more so than I believe either party originally anticipated. So let me at this point express to the people of Iceland the profound gratitude of the United States

government; without all they did on such short notice these these discussions could not have been as successful as they were.

Let me also add that we saw another welcome development in Iceland: serious evidence of Soviet willingness to negotiate on matters that up until now had been stalemated. In a few moments, I want to report to you on some of the areas where we saw movement.

But, first, it is my duty as President to point out that for all the progress made in Iceland, these talks were sobering — they brought home again the truth of the statement that nations do not mistrust each other because they are armed; they are armed because they mistrust each other. My fellow Americans, we must remember that the differences between the United States and the Soviet Union are deep and abiding and, as I have candidly told Mr. Gorbachev himself, our view of the source of that mistrust remains the same: the Soviet Union's record of attempting to impose its ideology and rule on the world.

Because there are no diplomatic quick-fixes to such profound differences, we adopted in Iceland the prudent, realistic and above all deliberate approach with the Soviets that we have pursued from the earliest days of our administration. You may remember that early in our first term instead of rushing into negotiations, we made it clear that we had no illusions about the Soviets or their ultimate intentions; we were publicly candid about the critical moral distinctions between totalitarianism and democracy. We said that the principal objective of American foreign policy is not just the prevention of war but the extension of freedom. And, we stressed our commitment to the

growth of democratic government and democratic institutions around the world; that is why we assisted freedom fighters who were resisting the imposition of totalitarian rule in Afghanistan, Nicaragua, Angola and other nations.

And yet at the same time we set out these foreign policy goals and began working towards them, we pursued another of our major objectives: that of seeking means to lessen tensions with the Soviets, ways to prevent war and keep the peace. As I say, we adopted a deliberate, step-by-step approach towards Soviet-American relations, gradually expanding and then intensifying the areas of mutual and multinational negotiation. Eventually, this steady approach paid off, it led to last year's summit conference in Geneva and the decision to schedule two other summit conferences in the future; and it lead to the recent stop in Iceland for planning and preparation.

So we have been deliberate; we have been realistic. We have been candid with the Soviets; we have been candid about the Soviets. We have been without illusions; we have been without false expectations. And all of this makes this current summit process so very different from that of previous decades.

And there has been another difference. To my mind the crucial difference. You see, my fellow Americans, no longer are the Soviets surprising America at every turn; no longer are they making us react hastily to their threats or respond weakly to their adventures or stand humiliated by every nickel-and-dime dictator under their influence.

America is no longer under siege. To the contrary, today

America's economic and military power is resurgent, the Western

democracies and the NATO alliance are revitalized, and all across the world nations are turning to democratic ideas and the principles of the free market.

Yes, the atmosphere surrounding the current summit process is different, it is different because the world is different; different because of the hard work and the sacrifice of the American people over the past five and one half years. Your energy has restored and expanded our economy, your self-sacrifice has sustained our military build-up; and your courage and sense of national unity in times of crisis like Lebanon and Grenada has warned our adversaries, heartened our friends and inspired the world. Freedom is on the march today; and it is on the march because -- in its critical hour, at the point of maximum danger it regained its strength and gathered its forces because you, the American people, stood steadfast in its defense.

That is why I can report to you tonight that the fruit of your work was evident in Iceland. Indeed, if there is one impression I carry away with me from these October talks, it is that we are seeing now those first tentative signs of harvest, a harvest of peace and freedom planted by the strength and resolve of the American people and their allies, a harvest that can be ours if, as a people, we persevere in the spirit that has brought us so far.

One startling evidence of this in Iceland was the entirely new nature of our discussions on the key issue of arms control. In past years, arms control negotiations had become a kind of international sting operation -- the Soviets would agree to stabilize some categories of weapons and then use loopholes to

greatly expand weapons not directly covered by our agreements. In the era of the 60s and 70s, for example, while the US reduced its deployment of nuclear warheads by 7,800 and lowered its megatonnage or explosive power by 75%, the the Soviets added more than 8,000 nuclear warheads to its arsnel of strategic missiles alone -- and half of these were added after the SALT II arms control treaty was signed in 1979. And, while the United States developed no new missiles, the Soviets developed several generations of strategic weapons of all kinds -- indeed, in just a few years they had pointed a thousand new warheads on medium range missiles at the cities of Europe. As one American Secretary of Defense put it: "We built and they built. We stopped and they kept building." Here then was the worst perversion of all: arms control agreements that justified the arms race, intensified it, and guaranteed Soviet superiority.

That is why in the early 1980s the United States sought to restore strategic balance with the Soviets by deploying weapons systems like the MX missile and the B-I bomber as well as install new medium range Cruise and Pershing missiles in Europe.

But even as we took these steps, I resolved that never again would arms control agreements be used to justify an arms buildup. That is why I put forth a series of new proposals calling not just for arms control but for arms reduction. We called for a 50% reduction in strategic missiles and similar redutions in the medium range weapons that are so threatening to our allies in Europe. And in related fields such as nuclear testing and chemical and biological weapons we proposed equally sweeping reductions.

And finally, we began to develop new technologies that could destroy strategic missiles in mid flight -- thereby looking to a day when the huge arsenals of these missiles would be obsolete.

And we offered to the Soviet Union an agreement by which they could share in our technology and deployment of our Strategic Defense System.

All this was on the table in Iceland. And, I am pleased to report to you that in several of these areas, the Soviets made serious responses. (INSERT)

But because each of these areas involves complex technology,
I cannot predict the nature or dates of future agreements. What
I can say is that for the first time, Soviet American
negotiations in these areas are headed in the right direction:
not just arms control but arms reduction.

In addition to this, there has been another beneficial and dramatic change in this summit process. For some time before our talks began, I had been saying that arms control negotiations alone could not bear the full weight of Soviet America relations; that problems in arms negotiations should not be permitted to thwart or imperil the entire Soviet-American relationship. I also noted that negotiations in other areas could sometimes assist in speeding up the arms reduction process. In short, doing more about arms control meant talking more than arms control. So I proposed "umbrella talks" with the Soviets -- negotiations with a broad based agenda. That is why we sought to expand the negotiating agenda -- to go to the source of political tension between the Soviets and ourselves: violations of human rights by the Soviets and military intervention -- either

directly by the Soviets or by their proxy states -- in the affairs of other nations.

It is just such an agenda that Secretary Shultz brought back with him from Moscow before last year's Geneva summit. For the first time, we had on the table those issues that went to the heart of our political tensions with the Soviet Union -- human rights and regional conflicts.

For Iceland, human rights was the first and the major item on our agenda. Only last week, here in the Oval Office, a noted Russian human rights leader, Yuri Orlov, described to me his suffering under the Soviet system; he was persecuted for leading an effort to get the Soviet government to live up to the human rights agreements it signed at Helsinki in 1975. Mr. Orlov's suffering is like those of far too many other scientists, intellectuals and artists in the Soviet Union.

And that is why I made it plain to Mr. Gorbachev that the United States would not seek to exploit improvement in these matters for purposes of propaganda. But I also make it plain that an improvement of the human condition within the Soviet Union is indispensable for an improvement in bilateral relations with the United States. For a government that will break faith with its own people cannot be trusted to keep faith with foreign powers. If the best and brightest inside the Soviet Union cannot trust the Soviet Government, how then can the rest of the world? So, I told Mr. Gorbachev -- again in Reykjavik as I had in Geneva -- we Americans place far less weight upon the words that are spoken at meetings such as these, than upon the deeds that

follow. When it comes to judging Soviet intentions, we are all from Missouri: you have got to show us.

Another area we took up in Iceland, a second issue at the heart of the differences between the Soviet and American sides, is that of regional conflicts. As I said to Mr. Gorbachev it would simply be unthinkable for world leaders to meet in splendid isolation even as the people of Afghanistan, Central America, Africa and Southeast Asia undergo the terrible sufferings resulting from Soviet invasion or military intervention. Again, our three part proposals for limiting regional conflicts were a critical agenda item. And (INSERT -- Afghanistan)

So once again, I think you can see there was some movement.

Finally, there was a fourth item besides arms reduction, recognition of human rights and the resolution of regional conflicts. This area was that of bilateral or people-to-people contacts. In Geneva last year, we welcomed the signing of several cultural exchange accords; in Iceland, we saw indications of more movement in these areas. But let me say now the United States remains committed to people-to-people exchanges that could lead to exchanges between not just a few selected elites but thousands of everyday citizens from both our countries.

So I think then you can see that we did make progress in Iceland on a broad range of topics. We set a date for a full-fledged summit; we reestablished our four point agenda; we discovered some new grounds of agreement; we probed again some areas of disagreement.

Now my fellow Americans, I cannot promise, nor can any President promise, that the talks in Iceland or our future

discussions with Mr. Gorbachev here in the United States will lead inevitably to great breakthroughs or momentious treaty signings. Indeed, we must bear in mind that because of the nature of the Soviet regime itself, many obstacles will be put in our path. When that happens, we must be prepared, not surprised. We must not permit such developments to disorient our policy or derail our initiatives. We must be deliberate and candid. We must make it clear, as we did in the recent Daniloff case, that the Soviet Union will be held responsible for its actions.

I can tell you that I am ultimately hopeful about the prospects for world peace and freedom. I know such optimism in a century that has seen so much war and suffering brought on by totalitarian rule seems unwarranted to some. Yet this confidence is based on more than an easy optimism; it springs from a quiet realization that totalitarian or militarist societies enjoy only initial advantages over free nations, advantages that, as British author Paul Johnson points out, are far outweighed by the "enormous reserves" of democratic societies, societies where national unity springs from popular consent. The resilency of a free society is one of the comforting lessons of all history, Mr. Johnson writes. "Grant it a breathing space and it will quickly develop a strategy of survival and form the instruments of victory. In the long run," he writes "it holds all the moral and intellectual cards and these are decisive in combination."

And because you, the American people, have given the cause of freedom that breathing space it so desperately needed, freedom does now hold the winning cards. And throughout the world, those

"enormous reserves" of free societies are making their presence and power felt.

I saw evidence of this when we left Iceland yesterday, and I spoke to our young men and women at our Naval installation there -- a critically important base far closer to Soviet naval ports than our own coastline. As always, I was proud to spend a few moments with them and thank them for the sacrifices and devotation to country.

But I must tell you that as I looked out on their faces I also thought of their families back home and the thousands of other faces I have seen in my journeys through America. On the trips from the airport when our motorcade travels down the highways, many Americans interrupt their day to greet us, to say hello; school children waving flags in front of their schools, laborers in blue overalls from garages and warehouses; office workers standing in their shirt sleeves; housewives with toddlers in their front yards. Always I remember those faces and I like to say how good it is for us to get out of Washington, to move across America, to see again towns and neighborhoods, baseball diamonds and football fields. And I say, too, I am thankful — thankful for the gift of the real America, the gift of coming home again.

Flying back last night from Iceland you can well imagine how grateful again I was for that gift of coming home, to a land like this. But I must tell you I also thought about other faces I have seen in my journeys -- the faces of the people of Iceland, and of so many other nations around the world -- faces filled with hope, hope that the leaders of the world might someday work

together and bring to every people and every land the blessings of peace and freedom.

"Wherever the banner of liberty is unfurled, there shall be America's heart, her prayers and her benedictions," John Adams once said. He spoke well of our destiny as a nation. My fellow Americans, we are honored by history, entrusted in our time with the oldest dream of humankind -- the dream of peace and freedom.

It is in pursuit of that dream I went of Geneva a year ago and to Iceland last week; it is in pursuit of that dream I have invited Mr. Gorbachev to visit us here for further discussions. And it is in pursuit of that dream that I thank you now for all the support you have given me in the past, and again ask for your help and your prayers as we continue on this journey toward peace.

Thank you and God bless you.

(DOLAN)
October 11, 1986
2:30 p.m. (Iceland)

PRESIDENTIAL REMARKS: ADDRESS TO THE NATION ICELAND MEETING MONDAY, OCTOBER 13, 1986

Good evening. As most of you know, I have just returned from meetings with the leader of the Soviet Union, General Secretary Gorbachev, in Iceland. As I did last year when I returned from the summit conference in Geneva, I want to take a few moments tonight to explain what took place in these discussions.

But first, let me remind you that from the very start of my meetings with Mr. Gorbachev I have always regarded you, the American people, as full participants. I know it may surprise the Seneral Secretary to learn that all this time there was a third party in the room, but, believe me, without your support and participation, none of these talks could have been held, nor could the ultimate aims of American foreign policy -- world peace and freedom -- be pursued. This faith in the intuitive wisdom of the people and the consent of the governed are the founding principles of our Republic. And it is for these principles, I went that extra mile to Iceland.

Now these most recent meetings with the Soviet leaders were intended as preparatory meetings, a planning session for a full fledged summit conference to be held when Mr. Gorbachev visits the United States. And tonight I am pleased to report to you that as Mr. Gorbachev and I agreed yesterday in Reykjavik the Soviet leader will be visiting America in the month of

Page 2 to the firmy hope we will build on what next year. I told Mr. Corbachev this was a good time to visit us here because already achieved.

I just wish the other items on our agenda in Iceland could have been as easily resolved. Don't mistake me; the Iceland talks were useful and quite productive -- more so than I believe either party originally anticipated. But, they were also sobering -- they brought home again the truth of the statement that nations do not mistrust each other because they are armed; they are armed because they mistrust each other. The differences between the United States and the Soviet Union are deep and abiding and, as I have candidly told Mr. Gorbachev himself, our view of the source of that mistrust remains the same: the Soviet Union's record of attempting to impose its ideology and rule on the world.

But because there are no diplomatic quick-fixes to such profound differences, we adopted in Iceland the prudent, realistic and above all deliberate approach with the Soviets that we have pursued from the earliest days of our administration. You may remember that early in our first term instead of rushing into negotiations, we made it clear that we had no illusions about the Soviets or their ultimate intentions; we were publicly candid about the critical moral distinctions between totalitarianism and democracy. We said that the principal objective of American foreign policy is not just the prevention of war but the extension of freedom. And, we stressed our commitment to the growth of democratic government and democratic institutions around the world; that is why we assisted freedom

fighters who were resisting the imposition of totalitarian rule in Afghanistan, Nicaragua, Angola Cambodia and elsewhere.

And yet at the same time we set out these foreign policy goals and began working towards them, we pursued another of our major objectives: that of seeking means to lessen tensions with the Soviets, ways to prevent war and keep the peace.

have been candid with the Soviets; we have been candid about the Soviets. We have been without illusions; we have been without false expectations. And all of this makes this current summit process so very different from that of previous decades.

As there has been another difference; To my mind the crucial difference. You see, my fellow Americans, American is no longer under siege -- no longer are the Soviets surprising America at every turn; no longer are they making us react hastily to their threats or respond weakly to their adventures or stand humiliated by every nickel-and-dime dictator under their influence.

To the contrary, today America's economic and military power is resurgent, the Western democracies and the NATO alliance are revitalized, and all across the world nations are turning to democratic ideas and the principles of the free market.

Yes, the atmosphere surrounding the current summit process is different, different because of the hard work and the sacrifice of the American people over the past five and one half years. Your energy has restored and expanded our economy, your self-sacrifice has sustained our military build-up; and your courage and sense of national unity in times of crisis like

Lebanon and Grenada have given pause to our adversaries, heartened our friends and inspired the world. Freedom is on the march today; and it is on the march because -- in its critical hour, at the point of maximum danger -- it regained its strength and gathered its forces while you, the American people, stood steadfast in its defense.

That is why I can report to you tonight that the fruit of your work was evident in Iceland. Indeed, if there is one impression I carry away with me from these October talks, it is that we are seeing now those first tentative signs of harvest, a harvest of peace and freedom planted by the strength and resolve of the American people and their allies, a harvest that can be ours if, as a people, we persevere in the spirit that has brought us so far.

One sign of this in Iceland was the discussion of the key issue of arms control. I think you know that when I came to office I committed America to a new realism about arms negotiations. Arms agreements would no longer be allowed to justify the arms race, to intensify it, or to guarantee Soviet superiority. That is why in the early 1980s the United States sought to restore the strategic balance with new weapons systems like the MX missile, the B-1 bomber as well as new medium range cruise and Pershing missiles in Europe.

Pat even as we took these steps, I put forth a series of new proposals calling not just for arms <u>control</u> but for arms <u>reduction</u>. We called for a 50% reduction in strategic offensive missiles and for the total elimination of the intermediate range nuclear forces that are so threatening to our allies in Europe

and Asia. And in related fields such as nuclear testing and chemical and biological weapons we proposed equally important reductions.

And finally, we launched a research program and revolutionary new technologies that could destroy ballistic missiles in flight -- looking to a day when the huge arsenals of these missiles would be obsolete, and defense strategies would rely on protection our peoples rather than on perpetuating their vulnerability. And we offered to the Soviet Union an agreement by which they could join with us in cooperative transition to this new strategic environment of mutual security.

All this was on the table in Iceland. And, I am pleased to report to you that in several of these areas, the Soviets made serious responses. (INSERT)

I cannot predict the nature or dates of future agreements. What I can say is that for the first time in a long time, Soviet-American negotiations in these areas are moving, and moving in the right direction: not just arms control but arms reduction.

For some time before our talks began, I had been saying that arms control negotiations alone could not bear the full weight of Soviet-American relations; that as I said, the real cause of the arms competition was political tensions growing out of our deeper differences. In short, doing more about arms control meant talking about more than arms control. So I proposed "umbrella talks" with the Soviets -- to expand the negotiating agenda, to go to the real source of political tension between the Soviets and ourselves.

One such issue is human rights. As John Kennedy once said,
"Is not peace, in the final analysis, a matter of human rights.
..?" Only last week, here in the Oval Office, a heroic champion human rights in the Soviet Union, Yuri Orlov, described to me the persecution he suffered for leading an effort to get the Soviet government to live up to the human rights agreements it signed at Helsinki in 1975. Mr. Orlov's suffering is like those of far too many other individuals of all walks of life in the Soviet Union — including those who wish to emigrate.

And that is why I made it plain to Mr. Gorbachev that the United States would not seek to exploit improvement in these matters for purposes of propaganda. But I also make it plain that an improvement of the human condition within the Soviet Union is indispensable for an improvement in bilateral relations with the United States. For a government that will break faith with its own people cannot be trusted to keep faith with foreign powers. If the best and brightest inside the Soviet Union — like Mr. Orlov — cannot trust the Soviet Government, how then can the rest of the world? So, I told Mr. Gorbachev — again in Reykjavik as I had in Geneva — we Americans place far less weight upon the words that are spoken at meetings such as these, than upon the deeds that follow. When it comes to judging Soviet intentions, we are all from Missouri; you have got to show us.

Another subject area we took up in Iceland lies at the heart of the differences between the Soviet Union and America. This is the issue of regional conflicts. I told Mr. Gorbachev that no summit good feeling can make the American people forget what Soviet actions have meant for the people of Afghanistan, Central

America, Africa and Southeast Asia. Until Soviet policies change, we will make sure that our friends in these areas -- those who fight for freedom and independence -- will have the support they need. And (INSERT -- Afghanistan)

So once again, I think these were useful discussions.

Finally, there was a fourth item besides arms reduction, human rights and the resolution of regional conflicts. This area was that of bilateral or people-to-people contacts. In Geneva last year, we welcomed the signing of several cultural exchange accords; in Iceland, we saw indications of more movement in these areas. But let me say now the United States remains committed to people-to-people that could lead to exchanges between not just selected elites but thousands of everyday citizens from both our countries.

So I think then you can see that we did make progress in Iceland on a broad range of topics. We set a date for a full-fledged summit; we reestablished our four point agenda; we discovered some new grounds of agreement; we probed again some areas of disagreement.

Now my fellow Americans, I cannot promise, nor can any President promise, that the talks in Iceland or our future discussions with Mr. Gorbachev here in the United States will lead inevitably to great breakthroughs or momentous treaty signings. Indeed, we must bear in mind that because of the nature of the Soviet regime itself, many obstacles will be put in our paths as we go along. When that happens, we must be prepared, not surprised. We must not permit such developments to disorient our policy or derail our initiatives. We must be

deliberate and candid. We must make it clear, as we did in the recent Daniloff case, that the Soviet Union will be held responsible for its actions.

I can tell you that I am ultimately hopeful about the prospects for world peace and freedom. I know such optimism in a century that has seen so much war and suffering brought on by totalitarian rule seems unwarranted to some. Yet this confidence is based on more than an easy optimism; it springs from a quiet realization that totalitarian or militarist societies enjoy only initial advantages over free nations, advantages that, as British author Paul Johnson points out, are far outweighed by the "enormous reserves" of democratic societies, societies where national unity springs from popular consent. The resilency of a free society is one of the comforting lessons of all history, Mr. Johnson writes. "Grant it a breathing space and it will quickly develop a strategy of survival and form the instruments of victory.

And because you, the American people, have given the cause of freedom that breathing space and throughout the world those enormous reserves of free societies are making their presence and power felt.

I saw evidence of this when we left Iceland yesterday, and I spoke to our young men and women at our Naval installation there -- a critically important base far closer to Soviet naval ports than to our own coastline. As always, I was proud to spend a few moments with them and thank them for their sacrifices and devotion to country. They represent America at its best: committed to defend not only our own freedom but also the freedom

of our allies and all the world; committed to maintaining the strength and resolve that makes possible productive negotiations with adversaries.

But I must tell you that as I looked out on their faces I also thought of their families back home and the thousands of other faces I have seen in my journeys through America. You know on these trips from the airport in our nations cities; when our motorcade travels down the highways, many Americans interrupt their day to greet us: office workers standing in their shirt sleeves; laborers in blue overalls from garages and warehouses; housewives in their front yards; children waving flags in front of their schools, . Always I remember those faces and I like to say how good it is for us to get out of Washington how grateful I am for the gift of the real America, the gift of coming home again.

Flying back last night from Iceland you can well imagine I was grateful again for that gift, the gift of coming home to a land like this. But I must tell you I also thought about other faces I have seen in my journeys — the faces of the people of Iceland and of so many other nations around the world — faces filled with hope, hope that the leaders of the world might someday work together and bring to every people and every land the blessings of peace and freedom.

"Wherever the banner of liberty is unfurled, there shall be America's heart, her prayers and her benedictions," John Adams once said. He spoke well of our destiny as a nation. My fellow Americans, we are honored by history, entrusted in our time with the oldest dream of humanity -- the dream of peace and freedom.

It is in pursuit of that dream I went to Geneva a year ago and to Iceland last week; it is in pursuit of that dream I have invited Mr. Gorbachev to visit us here for further discussions. And it is in pursuit of that dream that I thank you now for all the support you have given me in the past, and again ask for your help and your prayers as we continue on our journey toward peace.

Thank you and God bless you.

(DOLAN)
October 11, 1986
2:30 p.m. (Iceland)

PRESIDENTIAL REMARKS: ADDRESS TO THE NATION ICELAND MEETING MONDAY, OCTOBER 13, 1986

Good evening. As most of you know, I have just returned from meetings with the leader of the Soviet Union, General Secretary Gorbachev, in Iceland. As I did last year when I returned from the summit conference in Geneva, I want to take a few moments tonight to explain what took place in these discussions.

But first, let me say it's good to be home, and remind you that from the very start of my meetings with Mr. Gorbachev I have always regarded you, the American people, as full participants. I know it may surprise the General Secretary to learn that all this time there was a third party in the room, but, believe me, without your support and participation, none of these talks could have been held, nor could the ultimate aims of American foreign policy -- world peace and freedom -- be pursued. If am reporting to you tonight because this faith in the intuitive wisdom of the people and the consent of the governed are the founding principles of our Republic. And it is for these principles, I went that extra mile to Iceland.

And let me at this point express to the people of our old ally, Iceland, the profound gratitude of the United States, without all the magnificant arrangements they put together on such short notice these discussions could not have been as successful as they were. Now these meetings with the Soviet

negotiations, we made it clear that we had no illusions about the Soviets or their ultimate intentions; we were publicly candid about the critical moral distinctions between totalitarianism and democracy. We said that the principal objective of American foreign policy is not just the prevention of war but the extension of freedom. And, we stressed our commitment to the growth of democratic government and democratic institutions around the world; that is why we assisted freedom fighters who were resisting the imposition of totalitarian rule in Afghanistan, Nicaragua, Angola and other nations.

And yet at the same time we set out these foreign policy goals and began working towards them, we pursued another of our major objectives: that of seeking means to lessen tensions with the Soviets, ways to prevent war and keep the peace. As I say, we adopted a deliberate, step-by-step approach towards

Soviet-American relations, gradually expanding and then intensifying the areas of mutual and multinational negotiation.

Eventually, this steady approach paid off, it led to last year's summit conference in Geneva and the decision to schedule two other summit conferences in the future; and it lead to the recent stop in Iceland for planning and preparation.

So we have been deliberate; we have been realistic. We have been candid with the Soviets; we have been candid about the Soviets. We have been without illusions; we have been without false expectations. And all of this makes this current summit process so very different from that of previous decades.

crucial difference. You see, my fellow Americans, no longer are

the Soviets surprising America at every turn; no longer are they making us react hastily to their threats or respond weakly to their adventures or stand humiliated by every nickel-and-dime dictator under their influence.

America is no longer under siege. To the contrary, today
America's economic and military power is resurgent, the Western
democracies and the NATO alliance are revitalized, and all across
the world nations are turning to democratic ideas and the
principles of the free market.

Yes, the atmosphere surrounding the current summit process is different, it is different because the world is different; different because of the hard work and the sacrifice of the American people over the past five and one half years. Your energy has restored and expanded our economy, your self-sacrifice has sustained our military build-up; and your courage and sense of national unity in times of crisis like Lebanon and Grenada has given praise to our adversaries, heartened our friends and inspired the world. Freedom is on the march today; and it is on the march because -- in its critical hour, at the point of maximum danger it regained its strength and gathered its forces because you, the American people, stood steadfast in its defense.

That is why I can report to you tonight that the fruit of your work was evident in Iceland. Indeed, if there is one impression I carry away with me from these October talks, it is that we are seeing now those first tentative signs of harvest, a harvest of peace and freedom planted by the strength and resolve of the American people and their allies, a harvest that can be

ours if, as a people, we persevere in the spirit that has brought us so far.

One sign of this in Iceland was the discussion of the key issue of arms control. I think you know that when I came to office I committed America to a new realism about aims and some sources negotiations. Arms agreements would no longer be allowed to justify the arms race, to intensify it, or to guarantee Soviet superiority. That is why in the early 1980s the United States sought to restore the strategic balance with new weapons systems like the MX missile, the B-1 bomber as well as new medium range cruise and Pershing missiles in Europe.

Put even as we took these steps, I put forth a series of new proposals calling not just for arms control but for arms reduction. We called for a 50% reduction in strategic offensive missiles and for the total elimination of the intermediate range nuclear forces that are so threatening to our allies in Europe and Asia. And in related fields such as nuclear testing and chemical and biological weapons we proposed equally important reductions.

And finally, we launched a research program and revolutionary new technologies that could destroy ballistic missiles in flight -- looking to a day when the huge arsenals of these missiles would be obsolete, and defense strategies would rely on protection our peoples rather than on perpetuating their vulnerability. And we offered to the Soviet Union an agreement by which they could join with us in cooperative transition to this new strategic environment of mutual security.

All this was on the table in Iceland. And, I am pleased to report to you that in several of these areas, the Soviets made serious responses. (INSERT)

I cannot predict the nature or dates of future agreements. What I can say is that for the first time in a long time, Soviet-American negotiations in these areas are moving, and moving in the right direction: not just arms control but arms reduction.

For some time before our talks began, I had been saying that arms control negotiations alone could not bear the full weight of Soviet-American relations; that as I said, the real cause of the arms competition was political tensions growing out of our deeper differences. In short, doing more about arms control meant talking about more than arms control. So I proposed "umbrella talks" with the Soviets -- to expand the negotiating agenda, to go to the real source of political tension between the Soviets and ourselves.

One such core issue is human rights. As John Kennedy once said, "Is not peace, in the final analysis, a matter of human rights . .?" Only last week, here in the Oval Office, a heroic champion human rights in the Soviet Union, Yuri Orlov, described to me the persecution he suffered for leading an effort to get the Soviet government to live up to the human rights agreements it signed at Helsinki in 1975. Mr. Orlov's suffering is like those of far too many other individuals of all walks of life in the Soviet Union -- including those who wish to emigrate.

And that is why I made it plain to Mr. Gorbachev that the United States would not seek to exploit improvement in these

matters for purposes of propaganda. But I also make it plain that an improvement of the human condition within the Soviet Union is indispensable for an improvement in bilateral relations with the United States. For a government that will break faith with its own people cannot be trusted to keep faith with foreign powers. If the best and brightest inside the Soviet Union cannot trust the Soviet Government, how then can the rest of the world? So, I told Mr. Gorbachev — again in Reykjavik as I had in Geneva — we Americans place far less weight upon the words that are spoken at meetings such as these, than upon the deeds that follow. When it comes to indicate the spoken is the follow.

Another subject area we took up in Iceland lies at the heart of the differences between the Soviet Union and America. This is the issue of regional conflicts. I told Mr. Gorbachev that no summit good feeling can make the American people forget what Soviet actions have meant for the people of Afghanistan, Central America, Africa and Southeast Asia. Until Soviet policies change, we will make sure that our friends (-- those who fight for freedom and independence -- will have the support they need. And (INSERT -- Afghanistan)

So once again, I think these were useful discussions.

Finally, there was a fourth item besides arms reduction, human rights and the resolution of regional conflicts. This area was that of bilateral or people-to-people contacts. In Geneva last year, we welcomed the signing of several cultural exchange accords; in Iceland, we saw indications of more movement in these areas. But let me say now the United States remains committed to people-to-people exchanges that could lead to exchanges between

not just selected elites but thousands of everyday citizens from both our countries.

So I think then you can see that we did make progress in Iceland on a broad range of topics. We set a date for a full-fledged summit; we reestablished our four point agenda; we discovered some new grounds of agreement; we probed again some areas of disagreement.

Now my fellow Americans, I cannot promise, nor can any President promise, that the talks in Iceland or our future discussions with Mr. Gorbachev here in the United States will lead inevitably to great breakthroughs or momentous treaty signings. Indeed, we must bear in mind that because of the nature of the Soviet regime itself, many obstacles will be put in our path when that happens, we must be prepared, not surprised. We must not permit such developments to disorient our policy or derail our initiatives. We must be deliberate and candid. We must make it clear, as we did in the recent Daniloff case, that the Soviet Union will be held responsible for its actions.

I can tell you that I am ultimately hopeful about the prospects for world peace and freedom. I know such optimism in a century that has seen so much war and suffering brought on by totalitarian rule seems unwarranted to some. Yet this confidence is based on more than an easy optimism; it springs from a quiet realization that totalitarian or militarist societies enjoy only initial advantages over free nations, advantages that, as British author Paul Johnson points out, are far outweighed by the "enormous reserves" of democratic societies, societies where national unity springs from popular consent. The resilency of a

free society is one of the comforting lessons of all history,
Mr. Johnson writes. "Grant it a breathing space and it will
quickly develop a strategy of survival and form the instruments
of victory. In the long run," he writes "it holds all the moral
and intellectual cards and these are decisive in combination."

And because you, the American people, have given the cause of freedom that breathing space it so desperately needed, freedom does now hold the winning cards. And throughout the world, those enormous reserves of free societies are making their presence and power felt.

I saw evidence of this when we left Iceland yesterday, and I spoke to our young men and women at our Naval installation there -- a critically important base far closer to Soviet naval ports than our own coastline. As always, I was proud to spend a few moments with them and thank them for their sacrifices and devotion to country. They represent America at its best:

committed to defend not only our own freedom but also the freedom of allies committed to maintaining the strength and resolve that makes possible productive negotiations with adversaries.

also thought of their families back home and the thousands of other faces I have seen in my journeys through America. On the trips from the airport when our motorcade travels down the highways, many Americans interrupt their day to greet us. to say helle; school children waving flags in front of their schools, laborers in blue overalls from garages and warehouses; office workers standing in their shirt sleeves; housewives with toddlers in their front yards. Always I remember those faces and I like

diamonds and football fields. And I say, too, I am thankful thankful for the gift of the real America, the gift of coming home again.

grateful again I was for that gift of towing home to a land like this. But I must tell you I also thought about other faces I have seen in my journeys -- the faces of the people of Iceland and of so many other nations around the world -- faces filled with hope, hope that the leaders of the world might someday work together and bring to every people and every land the blessings of peace and freedom.

"Wherever the banner of liberty is unfurled, there shall be America's heart, her prayers and her benedictions," John Adams once said. He spoke well of our destiny as a nation. My fellow Americans, we are honored by history, entrusted in our time with the oldest dream of human the dream of peace and freedom.

It is in pursuit of that dream I went to Geneva a year ago and to Iceland last week; it is in pursuit of that dream I have invited Mr. Gorbachev to visit us here for further discussions. And it is in pursuit of that dream that I thank you now for all the support you have given me in the past, and again ask for your help and your prayers as we continue on this journey toward peace.

Thank you and God bless you.

(DOLAN)
October 11, 1986
2:30 p.m. (Iceland)

PRESIDENTIAL REMARKS: ADDRESS TO THE NATION ICELAND MEETING MONDAY, OCTOBER 13, 1986

Good evening. As most of you know, I have just returned from meetings with the leader of the Soviet Union, General Secretary Gorbachev, in Iceland. As I did last year when I returned from the summit conference in Geneva, I want to take a few moments tonight to explain what took place in these discussions.

But first, let me say it's good to be home, and remind you that from the very start of my meetings with Mr. Gorbachev I have always regarded you, the American people, as full participants. I know it may surprise the General Secretary to learn that all this time there was a third party in the room, but, believe me, without your support and participation, none of these talks could have been held, nor could the ultimate aims of American foreign policy -- world peace and freedom -- be pursued. I am reporting to you tonight because this faith in the intuitive wisdom of the people and the consent of the governed are the founding principles of our Republic. And it is for these principles, I went that extra mile to Iceland.

Let me begin by pointing out one important way in which the discussions I've just returned from in Iceland were unlike the earlier ones in Geneva: they were not a full-blown summit of the meetings with the Saciet leaders was intended as conference; they were preparatory meetings, a planning session

urransements

Tould not have been as successful as these discussions

page 2 fill fledged to be held when M borbacher wisity for a future summit conference, total was a base camp before the summit. The United States

You see, when Mr. Gorbachev and I met for the first time last year in Geneva we quickly settled one question the experts thought would be troublesome. While we were out walking together I told him that I would like him to see the United States and invited him to visit, and he said: "I accept." And then he told me he would like me to see the Soviet Union and invited me. And I said: "I accept." And so, the supposedly thorny question of future summits and their locations was settled as simply as that; I think you can see why face-to-face discussions between leaders of nations are frequently helpful.

But in Geneva, we did leave one critical matter unresolved:
the exact date of those future conferences. So in Iceland, this
was our top agenda item. I am pleased to report to you tonight
that we made progress, that -- as agreed in Geneva a year ago the next summit will take place here in the United States and -as Mr. Gorbachev and I agreed yesterday in Reykjavik 6 the
Soviet leader will be visiting America in the month of
next year. I told Mr. Gorbachev this was a good time to visit us
here because(e.g.Mr. Thomas will be on vacation, and the
mess will have a full supply of chocolate chip cookies.)

I just wish the other items on our agenda could have been as easily resolved. Don't mistake me; the Iceland talks were useful and quite productive -- more so than I believe either party originally anticipated. So let me at this point express to the people of Iceland the profound gratitude of the United States

government; without all they did on such short notice to the these discussions could not have been as successful as they were.

Let me also add that we saw another welcome development in Iceland: serious evidence of Soviet willingness to negotiate on matters that up until now had been stalemated. In a few moments, I want to report to you on some of the areas where we saw movement.

But, first, it is my duty as President to point out that for all the progress made in Iceland, these talks were sobering — they brought home again the truth of the statement that nations do not mistrust each other because they are armed; they are armed because they mistrust each other. My fellow Americans, we must remember that the differences between the United States and the Soviet Union are deep and abiding and, as I have candidly told Mr. Gorbachev himself, our view of the source of that mistrust remains the same: the Soviet Union's record of attempting to impose its ideology and rule on the world.

Because there are no diplomatic quick-fixes to such profound differences, we adopted in Iceland the prudent, realistic and above all deliberate approach with the Soviets that we have pursued from the earliest days of our administration. You may remember that early in our first term instead of rushing into negotiations, we made it clear that we had no illusions about the Soviets or their ultimate intentions; we were publicly candid about the critical moral distinctions between totalitarianism and democracy. We said that the principal objective of American foreign policy is not just the prevention of war but the extension of freedom. And, we stressed our commitment to the

growth of democratic government and democratic institutions around the world; that is why we assisted freedom fighters who were resisting the imposition of totalitarian rule in Afghanistan, Nicaragua, Angola and other nations.

And yet at the same time we set out these foreign policy goals and began working towards them, we pursued another of our major objectives: that of seeking means to lessen tensions with the Soviets, ways to prevent war and keep the peace. As I say, we adopted a deliberate, step-by-step approach towards

Soviet-American relations, gradually expanding and then intensifying the areas of mutual and multinational negotiation.

Eventually, this steady approach paid off, it led to last year's summit conference in Geneva and the decision to schedule two other summit conferences in the future; and it lead to the recent stop in Iceland for planning and preparation.

So we have been deliberate; we have been realistic. We have been candid with the Soviets; we have been candid about the Soviets. We have been without illusions; we have been without false expectations. And all of this makes this current summit process so very different from that of previous decades.

And there has been another difference. To my mind the crucial difference. You see, my fellow Americans, no longer are the Soviets surprising America at every turn; no longer are they making us react hastily to their threats or respond weakly to their adventures or stand humiliated by every nickel-and-dime dictator under their influence.

America is no longer under siege. To the contrary, today

America's economic and military power is resurgent, the Western

democracies and the NATO alliance are revitalized, and all across the world nations are turning to democratic ideas and the principles of the free market.

Yes, the atmosphere surrounding the current summit process is different, it is different because the world is different; different because of the hard work and the sacrifice of the American people over the past five and one half years. Your energy has restored and expanded our economy, your self-sacrifice has sustained our military build-up; and your courage and sense of national unity in times of crisis like Lebanon and Grenada has your passe to our warned our adversaries, heartened our friends and inspired the world. Freedom is on the march today; and it is on the march because -- in its critical hour, at the point of maximum danger it regained its strength and gathered its forces because you, the American people, stood steadfast in its defense.

That is why I can report to you tonight that the fruit of your work was evident in Iceland. Indeed, if there is one impression I carry away with me from these October talks, it is that we are seeing now those first tentative signs of harvest, a harvest of peace and freedom planted by the strength and resolve of the American people and their allies, a harvest that can be ours if, as a people, we persevere in the spirit that has brought us so far.

One startling evidence of this in Iceland was the entirely

new nature of our discussions of the key issue of arms control. I

think you know that when I came to office
In past years, arms control negotiations had become a kind of

international sting operation — the Soviets would agree to

a out aims negotiations and then use loopholes to

greatly expand weapons not directly covered by our agreements. In the era of the 60s and 70s, for example, while the US reduced its deployment of nuclear warheads by 7,800 and lowered its megatonnage or explosive power by 75%, the the Soviets added more than 8,000 nuclear warheads to its arsnel of strategic missiles alone -- and half of these were added after the SALT II arms control treaty was signed in 1979. And, while the United States developed no new missiles, the Soviets developed several generations of strategic weapons of all kinds -- indeed, in just a few years they had pointed a thousand new warheads on medium range missiles at the cities of Europe. As one American Secretary of Defense put it: "We built and they built. We stopped and they kept building." Here then was the worst Arms would no longer be allowed to JUSAZ Arms control agreements that justified the perversion of all: arms race, intensifyed it, and guaranteed Soviet superiority. That is why in the early 1980s the United States sought to with new weapons systems like the restore strategic balance with the Soviets by deploying weapons missle, the 13-1 bomber as well as new medium MX missile and the B-I bomber as well as install range truise and Pershing missles in Europe new medium range Cruise and Pershing missiles in Europe. While I come who they But even as we took these steps, I resolved that never again would arms control agreements be used to justify an arms buildup. That is why I put forth a series of new proposals calling not just for arms control but for arms reduction. We called for a 50% reduction in strategic missiles and similar reductions in the www.diafe - nuclear for a so threatening to our allies in and Asia. Europe And in related fields such as nuclear testing and chemical and biological weapons we proposed equally sweeping reductions.

And finally, we began to develop new technologies that could destroy strategic missiles in mid flight -- Chereby looking to a day when the huge arsenals of these missiles would be obsolete, and defined And we offered to the Soviet Union an agreement by which they could share in our technology and deployment of our Strategic environment of mutual security. Defense System.

All this was on the table in Iceland. And, I am pleased to report to you that in several of these areas, the Soviets made serious responses. (INSERT)

But because each of these areas involves complex technology? I cannot predict the nature or dates of future agreements. in along firms, I can say is that for the first time, Soviet American negotiations in these areas are headed in the right direction: not just arms control but arms reduction.

In addition to this, there has been another beneficial and

dramatic change in this summit process. For some time before our talks began, I had been saying that arms control negotiations alone could not bear the full weight of Soviet-America relations; that problems in arms negotiations should not be permitted to

distruct growing out of political tensions, growing out of
thwart or imperial the entire Soviet-Ampelean relationship. I deep ditteres also noted that negotiations in other areas could sometimes assist in speeding up the arms reduction process. In short, doing more about arms control meant talking more than arms control. So I proposed "umbrella talks" with the Soviets -- , negotiations with a broad based agenda. That is why we sought expand the negotiating agenda, of to go to the source of political tension between the Soviets and ourselveso violations of human rights by the Soviets and military intervention -- either

· IL Million

directly by the Soviets or by their proxy states -- in the affairs of other nations.

It is just such an agenda that Secretary Shultz brought back with him from Moscow before last year's Geneva summit. For the first time, we had on the table those issues that went to the heart of our political tensions with the Soviet Union -- human rights and regional conflicts.

One such core issue is human rights. As John Kennedy once said, "is not peace, for Iceland, human rights was the first and the major item on our agenda. Only last week, here in the Oval Office, a noted in the Sovert Union, champing of Russian human rights leader, Yuri Orlov, described to me his exsecution he suffered suffering under the Soviet system; he was persecuted for leading an effort to get the Soviet government to live up to the human rights agreements it signed at Helsinki in 1975. individuals, of all suffering is like those of far too many other scien walks of life, intellectuals and artists in the Soviet Union including these who wish to emigrate.

And that is why I made it plain to Mr. Gorbachev that the United States would not seek to exploit improvement in these matters for purposes of propaganda. But I also make it plain that an improvement of the human condition within the Soviet Union is indispensable for an improvement in bilateral relations with the United States. For a government that will break faith with its own people cannot be trusted to keep faith with foreign best and brightest inside powers. trust the Soviet Government, how then can the rest of the world? So, I told Mr. Gorbachev -- again in Reykjavik as I had in Geneva -- we Americans place far less weight upon the words that are spoken at meetings such as these, than upon the deeds that

Have to memin emigrani SomeWhere

follow. When it comes to judging Soviet intentions, we are all

Trim

from Missouri: you have got to show us

Another area we took up in Iceland a second issue at the heart of the differences between the Soviet and American sides.

It is that of regional conflicts. As I said to Mr. Gorbachev it food feeling can make he American people farget what Sant aches have meant for would simply be unthinkable for world leaders to meet in splendid

Africa and Southeast Asia undergo the terrible sufferings of from Soviet invasion or military intervention. Again, surface part proposals for limiting regional conflicts were a

critical agenda item. And (INSERT -- Afghanistan)

So once again, I think you can see there was some movement.

Finally, there was a fourth item besides arms reduction, recognition of human rights and the resolution of regional conflicts. This area was that of bilateral or people-to-people contacts. In Geneva last year, we welcomed the signing of several cultural exchange accords; in Iceland, we saw indications of more movement in these areas. But let me say now the United States remains committed to people-to-people exchanges that could lead to exchanges between not just a few selected elites but thousands of everyday citizens from both our countries.

So I think then you can see that we did make progress in Iceland on a broad range of topics. We set a date for a full-fledged summit; we reestablished our four point agenda; we discovered some new grounds of agreement; we probed again some areas of disagreement.

Now my fellow Americans, I cannot promise, nor can any President promise, that the talks in Iceland or our future

discussions with Mr. Gorbachev here in the United States will lead inevitably to great breakthroughs or momentious treaty signings. Indeed, we must bear in mind that because of the nature of the Soviet regime itself, many obstacles will be put in our path. When that happens, we must be prepared, not surprised. We must not permit such developments to disorient our policy or derail our initiatives. We must be deliberate and candid. We must make it clear, as we did in the recent Daniloff case, that the Soviet Union will be held responsible for its actions.

I can tell you that I am ultimately hopeful about the prospects for world peace and freedom. I know such optimism in a century that has seen so much war and suffering brought on by totalitarian rule seems unwarranted to some. Yet this confidence is based on more than an easy optimism; it springs from a quiet realization that totalitarian or militarist societies enjoy only initial advantages over free nations, advantages that, as British author Paul Johnson points out, are far outweighed by the "enormous reserves" of democratic societies, societies where national unity springs from popular consent. The resilency of a free society is one of the comforting lessons of all history, Mr. Johnson writes. "Grant it a breathing space and it will quickly develop a strategy of survival and form the instruments of victory. In the long run," he writes "it holds all the moral and intellectual cards and these are decisive in combination."

And because you, the American people, have given the cause of freedom that breathing space it so desperately needed, freedom does now hold the winning cards. And throughout the world, those

"enormous reserves" of free societies are making their presence and power felt.

I saw evidence of this when we left Iceland yesterday, and I spoke to our young men and women at our Naval installation there — a critically important base far closer to Soviet naval ports than our own coastline. As always, I was proud to spend a few moments with them and thank them for the sacrifices and devotation to country. Own freedom has also be freedom of allies, committed to maintaining the Strength and resolve that make gossible production adversaries, But I must tell you that as I looked out on their faces I adversaries,

also thought of their families back home and the thousands of other faces I have seen in my journeys through America. On the trips from the airport when our motorcade travels down the highways, many Americans interrupt their day to greet us, to say hello; school children waving flags in front of their schools, laborers in blue overalls from garages and warehouses; office workers standing in their shirt sleeves; housewives with toddlers in their front yards. Always I remember those faces and I like to say how good it is for us to get out of Washington, to move across America, to see again towns and neighborhoods, baseball diamonds and football fields. And I say, too, I am thankful — thankful for the gift of the real America, the gift of coming home again.

Flying back last night from Iceland you can well imagine how grateful again I was for that gift of coming home, to a land like this. But I must tell you I also thought about other faces I have seen in my journeys -- the faces of the people of Iceland, and of so many other nations around the world -- faces filled with hope, hope that the leaders of the world might someday work

Page 12

together and bring to every people and every land the blessings of peace and freedom.

"Wherever the banner of liberty is unfurled, there shall be America's heart, her prayers and her benedictions," John Adams once said. He spoke well of our destiny as a nation. My fellow Americans, we are honored by history, entrusted in our time with the oldest dream of humankind -- the dream of peace and freedom.

It is in pursuit of that dream I went ot Geneva a year ago and to Iceland last week; it is in pursuit of that dream I have invited Mr. Gorbachev to visit us here for further discussions. And it is in pursuit of that dream that I thank you now for all the support you have given me in the past, and again ask for your help and your prayers as we continue on this journey toward peace.

Thank you and God bless you.

(DOLAN)
October 10, 1986
2:30 p.m. (Iceland)

PRESIDENTIAL REMARKS: ADDRESS TO THE NATION ICELAND MEETING MONDAY, OCTOBER 13, 1986

Good evening. As most of you know, I have just returned from meetings with the leader of the Soviet Union, General Secretary Gorbachev, in Iceland. As I did last year when I returned from the Geneva summit conference, I want to take a few moments tonight to explain to you what took place in these most recent discussions.

But first, let me say it's good to be home and remind you that from the very start of my meetings with Mr. Gorbachev I have always regarded you, the American people, as full participants in our talks. I know it may surprise the General Secretary to learn that all this time there was a third party in the room, but, believe me, without your support and participation, none of these talks could have been held, nor could the ultimate aims of American foreign policy world peace and freedom be pursued.

And it's because faith in the intuitive wisdom of the people and the consent of the governed are the founding principles of our epublic that I want to Iceland and that I am reporting to you tonight. So let me begin by pointing out an important way in which the discussions I've just returned from in Iceland were unlike the earlier ones in Geneva: they were not a full-blown summit conference; they were preparatory meetings, a planning session, for a future summit conference.

You see, when Mr. Gorbachev and I met for the first time last year in Geneva we quickly settled one question the experts thought would be troublesome. While we were out walking together I told him that I would like him to see the United States and invited him to visit, he said: "I accept." And then he told me he would like me to see the Soviet Union and invited me. And I said: "I accept." And so the supposedly thorny question of future summits and their location was settled as simply as that; I think you can see why face-to-face discussions between leaders of nations are frequently helpful.

I just wish the other items on our agenda could have been as easily resolved. Don't mistake me; the Iceland talks were useful and quite productive -- more so than I believe either party originally anticipated. And by the way, at this point let me express to the people of Iceland the deep gratitude of the

United States government for all they did on such short notice to make these discussions possible. And let me also add that we saw another welcome development in Iceland: serious evidence of Soviet willingness to negotiate on matters that up until now had serious stalemates.

In a few moments, I want to address some of the specific areas where we saw movement. But, first, let we point out that for all the progress made in Iceland, these talks were sobering — they brought home again the truth of the statement that nations do not mistrust each other because they are armed; they are armed because they mistrust each other. My fellow Americans, it is my duty as Procident to remind you that the differences between the United States and the Soviet Union remain deep and abiding and, as I have never hesitated to point out to Mr. Gorbachev, our view of the source of that mistrust remains the same: the Soviet Union's record of attempting to impose its ideology and rule on the world.

And that is why in Iceland we proud what from earliest days this administration has been prudent, realistic and, above all, deliberate approach toward negotiations with the Soviets.

You may remember that instead of rushing into negotiations early in our first term, we made clear early in our first term that we had no illusions about the Soviets or their ultimate intentions; we were publicly candid about the critical moral distinctions between totalitarianism and democracy; we said that the principal objective of American foreign policy is not just the prevention of war but the extension of freedom. And, we stressed our commitment to the growth of democratic government and democratic

that is why institutions around the world; and we assisted freedom fighters Afghanistan, Nicaraqua, Angola and other places who were resisting the imposition of totalitarian rule.

And yet at the same time we set out and began work on these began work on foreign policy goals objectives: that of seeking was to lessen tensions with the Soviets, means to prevent war and keep the peace. deliberate, step-by-step approach towards Soviet-American relations, gradually expanding and then intensifying the areas of mutual and multinational negotiation. Eventually this steady approach paid off, it led to last year's summit conference in Geneva and the decision to schedule two other summit conferences in the future.

And that is what I believe makes this current summit process so very different from that of previous decades. We have been without illusions; we have been without false expectations. have been candid with the Soviets; we have been candid about the We have been realistic; we have been deliberate. Soviets.

And there has been one other crucial difference. Ou see, my fellow Americans, the atmosphere surrounding these meetings is different because the world is different; and the world is different because of you, the American people, and what you have achieved during these past five and a half years. We are longer permitting ourselves to be surprised by the Soviets at every turn, no longer permitting ourselves to react hastily to their threats or respond weakly to their adventures or to be humiliated by every nickel-and-dime dictator under their influence.

Today, America is no longer under siege. To the contrary, America's economic and military power is resurgent, the Western democracies and the NATO alliance are revitalized, and all across the world nations are turning to democratic ideas and the principles of the free market.

Today, freedom has a chance. Your energy in expanding America's economy, your willingness as a people to make the sacrifices to sustain our military strength has allowed the United States to play its historical role and assist in the struggle for world freedom. And, finally, in moments of crisis such as Lebanon and Grenada your sense of national unity has warned our advesaries heartened our allies and inspired the world. Let there be no doubt: freedom today is on the march because the American people have stood fast in its defense.

And if there is one impression I carry away with me from these October talks recently concluded in Iceland, it is that we are seeing now the first signs of harvest, a harvest of peace and freedom that will surely be ours if we perservere in the spirit of strength and resolve of the last five and one half years.

United States government for all they did on such short notice to make to these discussions possible. And let me also add as well that en seme points at at least we saw evidence of Soviet willingness to negotiate seriously and that we also welcomed this development.

In a few moments, I want to address some of the specific areas where we saw some movement. But first let me point out that for all the progress made in Iceland, these talks were sobering — they brought home to me again the truth of the statement nations do not mistrust each other because they are armed; they are armed because they mistrust each other. My fellow Americans, let us bear in mind that the differences between the United States and the Soviet Union remain deep and abiding and, as I have never hesitated to point out to Mr. Gorbachev, our view of the source of that mistrust remains the same: the Soviet Union's record of attempting to impose its ideology and rule on the world.

And that is why from its earliest day this administration has taken a prudent, realistic and, above all, deliberate approach toward negotiations with the Soviets. Instead of rushing into negotiations, we made clear early in our first orm that we had no illusions about the Soviets or their ultimate intentions; we were publicly candid about the critical moral distinctions between totalitarianism and democracy; we said again that the principal objective of American foreign policy is not just the prevention of war but the extension of freedom. And finely, we stressed our commitment to the growth of democratic government and democratic institutions around the world and

assisted freedom fighters in Afghanistan, Nicaragua, Angola and other places who were resisting the imposition of totalitarian rule on their people.

And yet at the same time we were setting out these foreign policy goals and working towards them we also pursued another of our major objectives: that of seeking ways to lessen tensions with the Soviets, ways to prevent war and keep the peace. We adopted a deliberate, step by step approach towards Soviet American relations, gradually expanding and then intensifying the areas of mutual and multinational negotiation. Eventually this steady approach paid off, it led to last year's summit conference in Geneva and the decisions to schedule two other summit conferences in the future.

And that is what I believe makes this current summit process so very different from that of previous decades. We have been candid with the Soviets and about the Soviets. We have been without illusions a false expectations. We have been realistic and deliberate.

my fellow Americans, these meetings are different because the world is different. And the world is different because of that you, the American people, have achieved during these past five and a half years. Freedom now has a chance. America is no longer under siege, we are no longer permitting ourselves to be surprised by the Soviets at every turn, no longer permitting ourselves to react hastily to their threats or respond weakly to their adventures, he lenger permitting ourselves to be humiliated by every-nickel and dime dictator under their influence.

To the contrary, today America's economic and military power is resurgent, the Western democracies and the NATO alliance are revitalized, and all across the world nations are turning to democratic ideas and the principles of the free market. of this, the United States continues to play its historical role, to assist in the struggle for world freedom. expanding America's economic power your willingness as a people to make the sacrifices that have sustained America's military strength - have allowed the United States to play its historical role assist in the the struggle for world freedom. And y in moments of or Freedom today is on the march and it is on the march especially the summit process and our recent talks in iceland. Had if there is that we harvest

that will surely come if we perservere it we the their people continne

and the second of the second o

the state of the first of the state of the s

The second of th

The state of the s

The same of the sa

The state of the second second

44 19 19 19 19 19 - Joseph He desir people

in the structure automotion of the past 5 1 years.

(DOLAN)
October 10, 1986
2:30 p.m. (Iceland)

PRESIDENTIAL REMARKS: ADDRESS TO THE NATION ICELAND MEETING MONDAY, OCTOBER 13, 1986

Good evening. As most of you know, I have just returned from meetings with the leader of the Soviet Union, General Secretary Gorbachev, in Iceland. As I did last year when I returned from the Geneva summit conference, I want to take a few moments tonight to explain to you what took place in these most recent discussions.

But first, let me say it's good to be home and remind you that from the very start of my meetings with Mr. Gorbachev I have always regarded you, the American people, as full participants in our talks. I know it may surprise the General Secretary to learn the third party in the room the third but, believe

me, without your support none of these talks could be held and without your participation, the ultimate aims of America's

foreign policy, world peace and freedom, can never be attained.

And it's because of these founding principles of our repolic, faith in the intuitive wisdom of the people and the consent of the governed that I am reporting to you tonight. So let me begin by pointing out that the discussions I ve just returned from in Iceland were unlike Geneva in one essential way; they were not a full-blown summit conference; they were

preparatory meetings, a planning session, for a future summit conference.

You see, when Mr. Gorbachev and I met for the first time in Geneva we quickly settled one question the experts thought would be troublesome. While we were out walking together at one point. I told him that I was a like him to visit the United States and invited him, he said: "I accept." And then he told me he would like me to see the Soviet Union and invited me. And I said: "I accept." And so the supposedly thorny question of future summits and their location was settled as simply as that I think you can see why face to face discussions between leaders of nations

But in Genera we did leave one critical matter unresolved the exact date of those future conferences. So in Iceland, this was our top agenda item. I am pleased to report to you tonight that we were successful in resolving this issue. As agreed in Geneva a year ago, the next summit will take place here in the United States and -- as Mr. Gorbachev and I agreed yesterday in Reykjavik -- he will be visiting America sometime in the month of ______ of next (this) year. I told Mr. Gorbachev this was a good time to visit us here because(Insert. e.g.the mess will have a full supply of chocolate chip cookies; Mr. Thomas will be on vacation.)

I just wish the other items on our agenda could have been as easily resolved. Don't mistake me; the Iceland talks were useful and quite productive -- more so than I believe either party originally anticipated. And by the way, at this point let me express to the people of Iceland the deep gratitude of the